

PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES' INCENTIVE-BASED BUDGETING SYSTEMS: HOW
RESPONSIBILITY CENTER BUDGET SYSTEMS AFFECT THE DECISION
MAKING STRATEGY OF STUDENT AFFAIRS LEADERS

Stevan J. Veldkamp

Submitted to the faculty of the School of Education
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Doctor of Education
in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Indiana University
May 2018

Accepted by the School of Education Faculty, Indiana University,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education.

Doctoral Committee

Alexander C. McCormick, Ph.D.

Donald Hossler, Ph.D.

Harold “Pete” Goldsmith, Ed.D.

Andrea Walton, Ph.D.

Date of Oral Examination
February 21, 2018

© 2018
Stevan J. Veldkamp
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Dedicated to my parents, Wilma and Norm.
For her empathy and his perseverance.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my faculty, colleagues, friends, and family for their support and encouragement. Learning from the brightest scholars in the field: Don Hossler, Doug Priest, Alex McCormick, George Kuh, Vasti Torres and Andrea Walton, has been a humbling and inspiring experience. Working for Damon Sims, Dick McKaig, and Pete Goldsmith and working with Darrell Stone, Jeremiah Shinn, R.J. Woodring, and Melissa Kish has been my luck, salvation, and reason for continuing in the field. Befriending Laura Osteen, Kaye Schendel, and John Austin have provided me with a constant source of support and editing. Finally, a very special thank you to Kathy Murphy for her continued assistance and support. Kathy, we did it. Without them, I would not have finished this project. Having my family (in particular my husband Gregg, daughter Caroline, Aunt Anna) cheering me on has enabled me to want to finish what I started in 1999. I have learned from the best, befriended the kindness, worked with the most talented, and been supported by unconditional love. In the words of Herman B Wells: I am lucky.

Stevan J. Veldkamp

PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES' INCENTIVE-BASED BUDGETING SYSTEMS: HOW
RESPONSIBILITY CENTER BUDGET SYSTEMS AFFECT THE DECISION
MAKING STRATEGY OF STUDENT AFFAIRS LEADERS

Major changes to higher education funding have resulted in public colleges and universities assuming corporate approaches to decrease costs and increase revenues. Large research universities are turning to Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) budget models as they have been cited as growing tuition revenues and decreasing costs. Even though there is excellent literature on the value of the advantages and disadvantages of RCM there is nothing regarding how student affairs is impacted in the model. The exploratory research investigates how two student affairs departments are affected by, and make decisions in, the RCM budget model by using a case study design. The results are then analyzed using Chaffee's (1983; 1985) decision-making framework.

Four main findings were identified. First, student affairs services are affected by RCM budget model. Second, RCM affects how student affairs services and programs are structured and delivered, especially as it incentivizes the replication of student affairs in academic schools. Third, RCM affects how student affairs positions and prioritizes decision making to create more resources such as selling services and teaching courses. Fourth, Senior Student Affairs Officer's (SSAO) perceive that central administration and academic school leadership have a compromised value of student affairs within a RCM model. Recommendations from the findings inform student affairs practice within an RCM environment.

Alexander C. McCormick, Ph.D.

Donald Hossler, Ph.D.

Harold “Pete” Goldsmith, Ed.D.

Andrea Walton, Ph.D.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iv
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Background	3
Problem Statement.....	7
Purpose of Study	9
Research Questions.....	10
Organization of the Dissertation.....	11
Chapter II: Review of the Literature	12
Overview	12
Justification	14
Guiding Organization.....	15
Section I: Components of RCM.....	18
Section II: Organizational Literature	24
Section III: Student Affairs Literature	33
Section IV: Decision Making Models	40
Conclusion	44
Chapter III: Research Methods.....	47
Motivation.....	47
Overview of Study.....	48
Research Questions.....	49
Research Tradition	50
Proposed Methodology	51
Ontological Perspective.....	52
Epistemological Perspective	53
Case Study Design.....	53
Research Sample	54
Research Design	56
Data analysis phase 1, Review of Year-End Reports and Websites.....	58
Data analysis phase 2, Interviews.....	58
Data analysis phase 3, Multi-site Case Study Analysis.....	59
Data analysis phase 4, Multi-site Case Study.....	59
Ethical Considerations and Trustworthiness.....	60
Strategy #1 - Subjectivity and Bias Check	60

Strategy #3- Member Checking.....	62
Strategy #4- Peer Review	62
Strategy #5- External Validity	62
Limitations	63
Summary	64
Chapter IV: Findings	65
Profile of Institutions and Interviewees	68
Major Finding One: RCM Affects Student Affairs Decision Making	70
Major Finding Two: SSAO Perception of How Student Affairs is Structured and Delivered..	77
Major Finding Three: SSAO Perception of How to Best Position Departments for More Resources	81
Major Finding Four: SSAOs Perceptions Regarding the Central and/or Academic Schools' Valuing of Student Affairs Work	89
Chapter V: Implications	97
RCM Advantages	99
RCM Disadvantages	100
Organizational Literature	101
RCM Prerequisites	103
Section II: SSAOs' Adaptive Versus Constructive Decision Making	105
Section III: Implications from the Exploratory Study	109
Clarifying Mission and Student Affairs Functions	110
Managing Crisis	112
Focusing on Health and Safety	113
Championing Student Affairs	113
Circumventing Administrative Hierarchy	114
Recommendations with Academic Schools	115
Communicating with Academic Schools	115
Sharing User Data with Academic School	116
Sense-Making for Academic Schools	117
Forming Interdependent Relationships with Academic Schools	117
Network Solutions with Academic Schools	118
Customizing Relationships with Academic Schools	119
Creating Agreements with Academic Schools	119
Consulting with Academic Schools	120

Selling Teaching to Academic Schools.....	120
Involvement and Engagement Changes to Academic Schools	121
Conclusion	122
References	126
Appendix A. IRB Approval Letter.....	135
Appendix B. Letter of Invitation to Study Participants	137
Appendix C. Interviews Questions	138
Appendix D. Informed Consent.....	140
Curriculum Vitae	

Chapter I: Introduction

The Great Recession of 2008 has negatively affected the financing of higher education (Breneman, 2002, 2009). State support has not kept pace with the rising cost of higher education. Health care and other social services' increasing expenses compete with higher education budgets which has led to a funding gap especially for state institutions (Breneman, 2002, 2009; Heller, 2006; Lyall, 2011).

Public universities have developed revenue generating strategies and cost-saving measures to address these challenges. An increasingly prevalent institutional strategy is to utilize corporate approaches to lower costs and generate revenue in an attempt to make up the difference created by the decrease in state support (Priest, Jacobs, & Boon, 2006). As a result, higher education and public institutions are relying more on tuition dollars to fill the gap in state funding. (Geiger & Heller, 2011; Hossler, 2006; Morpew & Eckel, 2009).

Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) systems have become popular within decentralized academic institutions, like large, state-funded, public research institutions (Gansemer-Topf & Englin, 2015; Priest & St. John, 2006). The diffusion of centralized decision making in the RCM model enables academic schools to make more autonomous decisions. In addition, the RCM model incentivizes academic schools to focus on increasing tuition revenue through course production and fixing

retention problems particular to their own school. Academic deans within these schools are then able to focus on solving these academic challenges because they have a total view of the problems and the ability to develop creative solutions with more readily available financial resources. The roles of academic school deans are adapted to emphasize budgetary oversight and control which is supposed to lead to fiscal efficiency and effectiveness (Priest, 2006; Rhoades, 2001; Volpatti, 2013; Whalen, 1991). This decentralization also allows for the reliance on, and/or the duplication of, existing centralized services. Centralized service duplication may be either an intentional or an unintentional decision to solve local, academic school problems.

Services and programs such as student affairs are mainly non-revenue generating, and rely on the tax paid to the central administration for these services. The central administration is in consultation with student affairs leaders to set the values and priorities of the central service departments. Gansemer-Topf and Englin (2015) declared, “budgets have significant impacts on the work and scope of student affairs, it is critical that student affairs professionals have a more macro level understanding of the higher education revenue and resource allocation landscape” (p. 71). Student affairs leaders may also need to understand at a micro level how a RCM budgeting system may impact their decisions.

Sensitivity to the relationships between student affairs, academic schools, and central administration is critical to ensure wise university decision making. Budgeting and financing of student affairs divisions are “undoubtedly affected by the changes in revenue streams, expenditure decisions, and budgeting models” such as RCM (Gansemer-Topf & Englin, 2015, p. 73).

These shifts may result in universities revisiting how programs and services, such as student affairs, advance the institutional mission and campus priorities (Romano, Hamish, Phillips, & Waggoner, 2009). With the proportion of funding for public institutions decreasing and the reliance on tuition dollars increasing, academic college leaders have gained additional responsibilities now as fiscal managers (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989; Volpatti, 2013). Consequently, central services such as student affairs departments may be viewed as an expense to academic colleges and other central administration. The competition for funds between student affairs and academic college priorities can be detrimental if the campus administration is not attentive about the careful management of student affairs planning and budgeting (Hearn, Lewis, Kallsen, Holdsworth, & Jones, 2006; Goldstein, 2012; Priest & Boon, 2006).

How student affairs leaders make decisions significantly impacts an institution's use of resources and the individual student's experience. Student affairs leaders have a critical role in positioning and tailoring student services to support institutional and/or academic schools' values and goals. Empirical research on decision-making frameworks utilized within RCM budget systems may aid and empower student affairs leaders in setting strategic directions for student services.

Background

The history of public institutions reliance on tuition dollars began in the 1970s and continues to the present day. The social compact created between higher education and state support has been viewed as a necessary part of American society (Hossler, 2003; Morphew & Eckel, 2009). Higher education contributed to the state's positive economic conditions, job training, civic life, increased tax base, and lower incarceration

rates. Prior to the 1970s, families, administrators, and state legislators had a philosophy of supporting higher education as it was considered a public good. Thelin (1997) discussed that state lawmakers were happy to support higher education as a partnership for economic growth and positive qualities associated with college educated populous.

Over the last four decades, the fiscal circumstances in which institutions have operated have dramatically changed. A brief review of higher education changes by each decade will create a background for this study. The tumultuous U.S. economic conditions have motivated higher education institutions to adopt business-like strategies to create new and consistent revenue (Priest & Boon, 2006). This institutional funding model shift has popularized incentive-based budgeting models like RCM. As a result of more institutions and student affairs now operating within RCM systems, it is important to understand the macro changes which led to this budget and planning phenomenon.

Hossler (2003) described the impact on higher education financing by stating:

During the last decades of the twentieth century higher education moved from primarily being seen as a public good to being seen as a private good. This shift is consistent with less public support and higher tuition rates, and with a shift to the privatization of higher education (p. 111).

During this 1970s, the state's established support of higher education was challenged by a national economic recession. This crisis impacted society's philosophical perspective of education, shifting it, from a public good to a private good (Archibald & Feldman, 2008; Dennison, 2003; Ehrenberg, 2006; Johnstone, 2005; Sontheimer, 1994; Thelin, 2013).

The resulting privatization of higher education, with the reduction of the proportion of state funding, left the burden of funding institutions to the non-profit sector to address the potential inequities of access, persistence, and educational attainment. Through this time period, higher education began to market itself to students and families as a commodity.

The family's contribution to the funding of higher education began to increase while state funding of programs and services decreased. Higher education institutions also began to focus their promotion efforts on the individual benefits of a college education as the path to get jobs and higher pay, rather than the aggregate benefit to the state (Hossler, 2003; Long, 2013; Rizzo, 2006; Thelin, 1997, 2013).

The economic recession lingered during the 1980s, exacerbating the philosophical and financial gap in the funding of higher education. During this time, the competition for state funding mandates rose sharply. Health care costs, infrastructure costs, and K-12 education costs became competing priorities with higher education (Dennison, 2003; Zumeta, 2004). The national economic slow-down weighed heavily in the debate. States and higher education institutions both were concerned with whether higher education was a public good that should be funded or a private good that should be paid for by students and families who could afford college. It was additionally viewed as a lack of state support, prompting institutions to curtail their reliance on state monies. This change resulted in public institutions becoming more like private institutions which required students and families to pay higher tuition costs (Johnstone, 2005; Morpew & Eckel, 2009; Thelin, 1997, 2013).

In the 1980s and 1990s, corporate principles, practices, and management techniques began to permeate institutions in an effort to raise financial resources. Priest et al. (2006) defined this privatization and corporatization of higher education as the "process of transforming low-tuition institutions that are largely dependent on state funding to provide mass enrollment opportunities at low prices into institutions dependent on tuition revenues and other earned income as central sources of operating

revenue” (p. 2). This shift in state funding placed new emphasis on higher education’s sensitivity to market demands. Thus, business-like practices were especially adopted by public institutions as they competed for students and families who would fill the budget gap created by the loss in state funding (Rizzo, 2006).

The erosion of state funding in the 2000s and 2010s only widened the fiscal gap, which continued to impact students and families with increased tuition costs. The undeniable dependency on tuition and fees for services solidified the necessity for institutional leaders to assess budget and planning practices. Corporate marketing, management, and budgeting models were established as institutions became more tuition driven. Incentive based budgeting systems, which focus attention on revenue generation, are an approach to make up for state budget shortfall while keeping institutional cost low (Goldstein, 2005; Haeuser 2000; Long, 2013; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

Student affairs leaders are impacted by these changes. Gansemer-Toph and Englin (2015) emphasized this claim by stating, “These changes have affected the financial landscape of higher education and, unsurprisingly, have influenced the budgeting and finances of student affairs” (p. 63). However, these authors also suggest that the institutional goal of optimizing efficiency and the pattern of increasingly restricted state support for higher education can result in a reprioritization of campus decision making. As priorities shift, it is paramount for student affairs leaders to join the campus conversation on how their departments’ best contribute to the mission, vision, and value of their institutions.

Problem Statement

The degree of separation between the central administration and the oversight of the academic school's decision-making process impacts the dean's role in academic schools and potentially the student affairs leader's role. The inherent assumption of a responsibility center and decentralized budget system is that academic schools will be more responsive to generating revenue because they have more "intimate knowledge" of how the school can best utilize resources (Strauss & Curry, 2002). This model distances central administration from the management of the academic schools. Deans may even see their role expand into the budgeting and planning arenas (Priest, 2006; Rhoades, 2001; Volpatti, 2013) and may become overly focused on revenue generation and decreasing costs. Rhoades (2001) warned:

What is productive for a department/college may not be for the institution. Productivity is increasingly a function of cooperation among academic and [student affairs] support units. In this context, initiatives that focus on academic units and pit them against each other can be counterproductive (p. 625).

If the academic deans view student affairs services as necessary for admission, persistence, and retention of students and the centralized student affairs services are inadequate, then they may begin to develop as well as maintain their own local student affairs services. Conversely, the concentration on maintaining or increasing tuition revenue may cause academic deans to rely more heavily on centralized or central utility student affairs. As resource allocation and requisitions become even more competitive, RCM systems grow in popularity. Porter (2013) stated the right budget distribution is necessary between centralized student affairs services, where scale economies are possible, and academic schools, where unique student needs dominate (p. x). Either way, it is essential that student affairs leaders understand and lead their departments within this

complex RCM environment. How do student affairs leaders make decisions within RCM budgeting systems and are their relationships with academic schools different as a result of some schools' ability to capitalize on RCM?

Most of the literature regarding student affairs leaders' decision-making strategies is framed within the general academic experience. Further, the literature does not incorporate budgetary models let alone the specific RCM model. Consequently, there is minimal literature describing how RCM affects decision-making strategies of centrally funded entities (Breneman 2002; Hearn, Lewis, Kallsen, Holdsworth, & Jones 2006; Hossler, 2006; Johnson 2005; Priest, Becker, Hossler, St. John; 2002; Priest, St. John, & Boon 2006; Strauss & Curry, 2013; Volpatti 2013; Whalen, 1991). Even less common is literature on the operation of non-revenue generating central services (e.g. student affairs services, within a RCM model; Barr, 2002; Porter, 2013). Further, there is a dearth of literature describing how student affairs leaders navigate RCM environments. The literature closest to addressing student affairs decision making within RCM systems consists of RCM budget and planning studies within the academic school and opinion pieces. The existing literature describes how RCM systems encourage institutional entrepreneurialism and exacerbate institutional decentralization.

To help address the gap in literature, this exploratory study examines the challenges of student affairs leaders and how they make strategic decisions within the RCM environment. This study may also provide an understanding of how student affairs leaders perceive the academic schools' relationship to and awareness of their role as a central utility.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the study is to better understand the decision-making process of student affairs services leaders when making strategic decisions in the context of a RCM budgeting system. As Stocum and Rooney (1997) wrote, “RCM is not a magic formula that can substitute for strong, effective administrative management and leadership or the need for judicious decision-making by administrators” (p. 56). As RCM is increasingly popular among large public research institutions, the study will focus on how student affairs leaders navigate this budgeting model. Additionally, the study will gain an understanding of how student affairs leaders plan to increase revenue: either from an allocation of financial resources from the central administration or directly from academic schools.

The study will examine how student affairs leaders position their unit with the central administration, academic units, and/or their own beliefs and values for the student experience. This study will apply Chaffee’s (1983, 1985) Decision Making Theory as a conceptual framework. Chaffee’s two approaches to organizational decision making are categorized as Adaptive and Constructive decision making (Chaffee, 1983 & 1985; Mintzberg 1973; Wieck, 1976;). This study will determine whether student affairs leaders make similar decisions using the Adaptive Model or the Constructive Model. The study is designed to determine if there are common patterns or trends among student affairs leaders when designing strategies to either maintain their values or to become more responsible to academic units’ values and goals. RCM is increasingly popular among large public research institutions in the current higher education context.

Therefore, this study will focus on how student affairs leaders at two public research institutions navigate this particular budgeting system.

Research Questions

The following research questions guide this study in order to examine student affairs leaders' decision making within RCM environments. As there is a shortage of empirical research on student affairs organizational decision-making strategies in an RCM environment, the following questions will also explore perceptions of how RCM impacts student affairs relationship with the central administration and academic schools.

The main research question asks if and to what extent does a RCM model affect student affairs organizational decision making? Secondary questions are ones that aid in a more robust understanding of how RCM affects student affairs leaders' decision making. They include: how student affairs is organized, how student affairs is valued, and how student affairs acquires resources. The impact of these answers could reflect the institutional value of student affairs and/or its efficacy in supporting institutional values and goals.

As an example, the RCM budget model may affect how student affairs are structured and delivered. It is important to investigate if there is a relationship with RCM and if student affairs is more or less distributed and/or centralized. A centralized model could express a stronger institutional value of the importance of student affairs. Finally, how student affairs leaders' position and/or prioritize decision making in the acquisition of campus resources may also assist the researcher in concluding if RCM affects student affairs decision making.

The research design will then compare two public research institutions. By comparing two institutions, this study will discover if similarities exist between student affairs decision-making strategies that are prompted by RCM model. The data will be used to determine if in a multiple situation case study there are significant similarities by comparing two public research institutions. The study will enable a basic understating of how student affairs function in the RCM environment.

Organization of the Dissertation

In the first chapter, I have presented information regarding the current fiscal state of higher education and why institutions are moving toward generating more tuition revenues. In the second chapter, a review of literature will be presented which highlights five areas: definition of terms; overview of managerial concepts related to large public institutions; effects of RCM on institutional decision making; entrepreneurial activities by student affairs to increase revenue; decision-making management theory based on Chaffee's (1983, 1985) Decision Making Theory or models. The third chapter will include the proposed methods to be utilized in this study, the fourth chapter will present the data and provide analysis and the final fifth chapter will interpret and summarize the data and study findings.

Chapter II: Review of the Literature

A common conversation among state supported higher education professionals' focuses on how funding sources affect the educational mission of their institutions. Institutional leaders bemoan the diminishing proportion of state budget allocations. To make up for the budget shortfall, campus administrators, academic schools, and even centralized services such as student affairs, are building new revenue streams. The literature on how these revenue changes impact student affairs leaders is missing from the literature. For student affairs to be an essential and a central service, it is vital for departmental leadership be in a fully-vested position in its exchanges and judgments regarding strategies to enact institutional mission and priorities (Porterfield, Roper, & Whitt, 2011). It has also been noted that higher education revenue and resource allocation systems must be understood by student affair leaders as budgeting systems directly impact their ability to support the scope and scale of their work (Gansemer-Topf & Englin, 2015, p. 71). This literature review builds an understanding of the concepts and constructs which intersect with student affairs perceptions of the acquisition of resources in an RCM environment.

Overview

Over the last few decades the fiscal environment in which public higher education institutions operate has drastically changed. States have decreased the proportion of financial support given to its public universities. Public research universities in particular have experienced a greater decline in state appropriations, as a percentage of operating revenue, compared to other types of institutions (Geiger, 2015). As a result, these institutions are shifting to tuition dollars to fill the gap created by a lack of state funding

(Breneman 2002; Geiger, 2015; Geiger & Heller, 2011; Hossler, 2006; Johnstone 2001; Johnson 2005). This shift has resulted in the more prevalent use of corporate methods of budgeting and planning to grow and maintain financial resources (Hossler, 2006; Kirshstein & Hurlburt, 2012; Priest, St. John, & Boon 2006; Strauss & Curry, 2013; Volpatti 2013). And yet, little is known about the impact these budgeting methods have on student affairs organizations.

RCM is touted as an incentive-based budget and planning model that uses corporate methods (Hearn, Lewis, Kallsen, Holdsworth, & Jones, 2006; Goldstein, 2005, 2012; Johnson, 2005; Priest & Boon, 2006; Strauss & Curry, 2002 & 2013; Whalen, 1991). Within a RCM system, academic schools keep a portion of the tuition revenue they generate. Central utilities, such as student affairs, are mainly funded by a tax academic schools pay to the central administration from the tuition dollars they generate. Within the RCM budgeting system, it is well documented that academic deans focus on generating revenue and decreasing expenses (Straus & Curry, 2013; Volpatti, 2013). Significantly less documented is how student affairs leaders make decisions to determine services within institutions that have employed a RCM budget and planning system (Evans, 2011; Gold, Golden, & Quatroche, 1993; Haeuser, 2000; Priest, St. John, & Tobin, 2002; Straus & Curry, 2013; Volpatti 2013).

The priorities of student affairs are to enhance student success, persistence, and retention. There is well-established empirical research on the effectiveness of student affairs in enhancing student success (Torres & Walbert, 2010). Additionally, as higher education and public institutions in particular have encountered budget crisis, there is literature regarding how student affairs leaders are being challenged to maintain or revise

their priorities with existing or declining resources (Ardaiolo, 2010; Barr, 2002; Harrison, 2010; Porter, 2013; Ramano, Hanish, Phillips, & Waggoner, 2010; Varlotta, 2010).

Varlotta (2010) stated that it is imperative that student affairs leaders consider strategic planning to align services with institutional values, vision, and goals in an effort to support student success. It has been noted that these decisions may either support or challenge the enduring values of student affairs in support of the institutional mission. Student affairs budget and planning decisions may adapt to favor academic school priorities that may or may not be consistent with holistic institutional priorities. This exploratory study will examine student affairs leaders' decision-making practices within a RCM system.

Justification

The existing literature describes how RCM systems enhance academic missions and priorities through institutional entrepreneurialism and decentralized decision making. What is unknown is how it affects the decision making of centrally funded student affairs. Evans (2011) called for an investigation of the perceptions about the success or failure of the RCM model and its acceptance by the universities. This study acknowledges and strongly suggests that finding a way to adequately determine appropriate budgets for student affairs in a RCM system is difficult (p. 109). As Priest, St. John, and Tobin (2002) have noted, RCM systems are evolving and are very much a work in progress. In a more recent study, Hearn, Lewis, Kallsen, Holdsworth, and Jones (2006) add a call for more empirical research on the benefits and challenges of the RCM budgeting approach. The National Association for Campus and University Budget

Officers article entitled “*The Buck Stops Elsewhere*” (2013) summaries the possible problems within RCM environments by stating:

Considerable evidence suggests that the allocation of indirect administrative costs has not significantly contributed to intelligent debate about the right distribution of service functions between central providers [student affairs] (where scale economies are possible) and local units [academic schools] (where unique customer needs dominate). Deans complain about excessive costs without commensurate services [student affairs]; central providers [student affairs] complain about inadequate funding and excess demand, but persist in their monopolistic ways. No one brokers the debate, or diffuses it with good data. Too few consequences ensue. (p2.)

The importance of this study is rooted in the fact that not only is there limited research but also in the call for leaders to make quality decisions in an era of fiscal scarcity for higher education. Varlotta (2010) recommended student affairs leaders master effective strategies, such as strategic planning and corporate budgetary practices, to navigate tough fiscal times. These strategies should outline decision-making frameworks which explain how a RCM environment may or may not affect student affairs resources (Varlotta, 2010; Woodard, 1995). This particular study attempts to bridge that gap in the existing literature.

Guiding Organization

Given the lack of research on the perceptions of student affairs leaders as they negotiate and lead student affairs departments in a RCM budget system environment, this study will approach the literature through an in-depth review of RCM and RCM organizational qualities. The organization of literature will begin with an exploration of the RCM. Embedded within the literature are organizational constructs that will help create an understanding of the environment student affairs leaders operate. Then, the research will conclude with an overview of decision-making theory that will help

categorize the perceptions of student affairs administrators in decision making (Chaffee, 1983 & 1985; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Chaffee's (1983, 1985) decision-making theory will be used as the conceptual framework to analyze the data.

In the first section, components of RCM system will be discussed including the effects on institutional mission and the decentralized decision-making qualities of RCM. There is a difference in opinion concerning whether RCM supports or denigrates institutional missions. Early literature discussing RCM system in the 1970s was limited, therefore the review of the literature from the 1979 to present is utilized. Description of RCM system will review both the positive (Gros Louis 2002; Hearn, Lewis, Kallsen, Holdsworth, & Jones 2006; McBride, Neiman & Johnson, 2000) and negative outcomes (Adams, 1979; Breneman, 2002; Curry, Laws & Strauss, 2013; Gansemer-Toph & Englin, 2015; Kezar & Eckel, 2004; Murray, 2000; Priest & Boon, 2006; Rhoades, 2001). The RCM literature is most often presented through case studies of academic leadership and/or opinion pieces. Limited opinion pieces discuss student affairs leaders' knowledge, understanding, and leadership within an RCM system. A mixture of peer-reviewed case studies, scholarly reflections, institutional reports, journal articles, and doctoral dissertations were reviewed. The next section reviews the literature on RCM and how the budgeting system interacts with institutional and organizational properties and management theories.

In the second section, the focus will shift to the articles most frequently cross-referenced in both the RCM and organizational literature. There is a discussion of salient organizational theories and models which interact and impact RCM systems. These concepts are prominently featured in the robust organizational literature from the 1970s

to the present. Whalen (1991) outlined a formula for understanding the relationship between budget systems and organization theories that will be used to organize this portion of the review. Descriptions of organizational constructs relevant to RCM include: decentralization (Morgan, 2006; Priest & Boon, 2006; Strauss & Curry, 2002), loose-coupling (Weick, 1976, 2005; Whalen, 1991), ambiguity (Baldrige, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 1977), autonomy (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989; Stocum & Rooney 1997), interdependence (Dill, 1984; Massy, 1990), and duplication (Bess & Dee, 2008; Dubeck, 1984; Strauss & Curry, 2002).

In the third section, a review of current student affairs management, budget, and planning literature highlights the need for further empirical research into how student affairs is narrowly considered in RCM budget and planning processes. Student affairs operating, budgeting, and planning is discussed in the literature and establishes student affairs management trends. The organization of the literature categorizes student affairs management strategies (Ardaiolo 2010; Banning & Kuk, 2009; Kezar & Eckel 2008; Kotler & Murphy, 1981; Lovell & Kosten, 2000; Mason & Eldridge, 2010; Romano, Hanish, Phillips, & Waggoner 2009; Schuh 2003). These trends are then compared to characteristics in the description of academic school RCM case studies (Bess & Dee, 2008; Dubeck, 1984; Priest & Boon, 2006; Whalen, 1991). This section concludes with a call for more empirically-based research on how student affairs leaders negotiate the RCM system and environment.

Finally, after discussing and examining how student affair leaders navigate their institutional culture, process, and priorities, section four examines Decision Making Theory. The framework for understanding how student affairs leaders make decisions

utilizes Chaffee's (1993) Decision Making Theory. The literature provides a clear approach to the characteristics found in Adaptive and Constructive management decision-making (Cekic, 2008; Chaffee, 1983; Gansemer-Toph & Englin, 2015; Varlotta, 2010; Whalen, 1991). This review then links institutional reactions and student affairs leaders' choices to organizational Decision Making Theory. The Decision Making Theories and approaches will be used to both frame and examine how student affairs leaders make strategic decisions for their student affairs units.

Section I: Components of RCM

This section reviews the literature regarding the impacts of RCM. It includes RCM's effect on institutional mission and academic deans but highlights the dearth of literature on how student affair's leaders make decisions. As previously noted, RCM is a decentralized budgeting system that distances or disconnects the central administration from decision making, allowing academic schools to make autonomous decisions regarding their strategic initiatives and fiscal resources. Dubeck's (1984) critique coins the popular reference that in RCM budget systems each academic school floats "every tub on its own bottom." The tub in this reference is each academic school's budget and the bottom refers to each school's responsibility for all its costs and revenues. Given the higher education fiscal crisis, universities may be interested in floating more tubs in order to develop revenue and cut costs. This confluence of needs may encourage more universities to implement a RCM system.

RCM Advantages

Originally implemented at University of Pennsylvania in the 1970s, RCM is a type of incentive-based budgeting system (Curry, Laws, & Strauss, 2013; Massy, 1996).

The benefit of an RCM system is that decision makers are more alert to expenses and revenue-generating decisions (Whalen, 1991). Therefore, the dean of an academic college is in the best position to make financial decisions and is more efficient, innovative, and purposeful with their budget (Whalen, 1991; Strauss & Curry, 2002; Priest & Boon 2006).

The literature on RCM also explains the scope and impact the system has on higher education institutions missions. RCM systems are celebrated as supportive of the educational mission of the institution. Specifically, RCM systems have a positive impact on the primary institutional mission of teaching (Gros Louis, 2002; Hearn, Lewis, Kallsen, Holdsworth, & Jones 2006). Empirical research has found that RCM has a positive impact on academic schools' retention, course production, and entrepreneurship (Gjerding, Wilderon, Cameron, Taylor, & Scheunert, 2006; Hearn et al., 2006; Strauss & Curry, 2006; Whalen, 1991). In a study of three large universities, academic school deans reported that a RCM budgeting system was effective in meeting educational needs such as course production (Priest & Boon, 2006).

In the RCM model, academic deans are charged to develop solutions to academic problems as a result of their proximal knowledge coupled with their control of financial resources to solve these challenges (Gold, Golden, & Quatroche, 1993; Hoover, 2011; Volpatti, 2013). The degree to which the central administration detaches itself from the oversight of the academic unit's decision-making process has an impact on the management of the academic school (Hoover, 2011; Stocum & Rooney, 1997). Hoover (2011) stated that it is "clear that the drive for revenue creates a different environment than what exists in a centrally controlled system" (p. 66). In the Murray (2000) study of

three large universities, academic school deans shared, “It makes sense to push the responsibility and decision-making down to the people that know their areas—the deans of the schools” (p. 46). Hoover (2011) reinforced these conclusions at three other research intuitions, reporting that RCM encourages autonomy and ownership and increases the amount of responsibility and accountability in each of the schools. However, without training, academic deans may be approaching their positions more instinctively, territorially, and not as holistically (Hearn, Lewis, Kallsen, Holdsworth, & Jones, 2006).

RCM Disadvantages

Critics of RCM have noted that the institutional mission can be compromised if institutions implement a RCM system. Corporate-like approaches have documented disadvantages including interpersonal and organizational conflict as well as loss of institutional mission and values (Breneman, 2002; Kezar & Eckel 2008; Murray 2000; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1974, 2003). Adams (1997) offered that institutions employing RCM systems may change their values and structures. He claims that the rationality of RCM budget system “would further the fractionalization of what remains of the ‘uni-versity’ and greatly lessen its ability to fulfill its core educational, cultural, and social mission” (p. 61). Douglass (2013) characterized the use of RCM system as contributing to a tribal mentality among schools and departments, especially at research intensive universities. A RCM comparison study at three large research institutions found that a perceived culture of self-centeredness detracted from a culture of “sharing, collaborating, [and] recognizing points of possible joint programs” (Hoover, 2011, p. 66). Because of the funding model and increased growth of major public universities, RCM has been characterized as

“fostering the idea of the ‘multiversity,’ universities become less communal and less aware of their collective purpose” (Douglass, 2013, p. 19). A RCM case study by McBride, Neiman, and Johnson (2000) reported an academic dean stating “both costs and revenues must always be analyzed in relationship to institutional values” (p. 207).

Critics warn that RCM may develop into an unhealthy system that is concerned with profits and costs versus the educational mission. Whalen (1991) asserted that as conversations about principles and missions disappear, administrators are left debating money. This suggests RCM systems’ priorities are fiscal versus mission driven. In a study of a large public research institution, Hearn et al. (2006) suggested a challenge exists when “incentives-based thinking, once [RCM is] implemented and embedded in the organizational culture, may grow beyond healthy bounds” (p. 292). RCM may incentivize competition and may contribute to territorialism. As Stocum and Rooney (1997) noted, once inter-school or departmental competition is established, it can become difficult for those entities to see beyond immediate goals to achieve larger organizational goals.

Further, a culture of uncontrolled innovation permeates higher education institutions. Breneman (1993) observed that “there are constant pressures from within to expand activities... and improve the quality of the institution” (p. 2). As academic schools in an RCM system are more autonomous in how they spend their budgets, expanded services may increase costs. Cole (1993) asserted that decentralized budget and planning systems limit critical decision making for academic schools and student affairs which may lead to unhealthy growth that RCM systems may exacerbate. Once these decision patterns are established, the central administration may find it difficult to

redirect student affairs and academic schools to combine or optimize at the cost of larger organizational goals (Massy, 1990). Breneman (2002) reinforced this by stating “the danger lies in the cumulative effect of the incremental changes, each one seemingly minor but collectively altering the nature of the enterprise” (p. 5). A report generated by the Pew Higher Education Research Program (1990) stated that the “unfettered expansion of the administrative lattice” or the growth of organizational systems, positions, and services should be curtailed or even reversed if higher education costs are to be maintained. RCM systems may allow for administrative costs to grow, unless governed closely by the central administration (Strauss & Curry 2006).

In an analysis of RCM, the Strauss and Curry (2002) study examined administrators’ opinions of their campus’ RCM budgeting system and the impact of decentralized academic management of the institution. Strauss and Curry (2002) argued that the decentralization of authority is a natural university function but that the decentralization of responsibility is not, asserting that:

Criticisms and lesson learning make very clear that formal decentralized management requires never-ending vigilance to assure that the fundamental mission and goals are not being subverted, and a major commitment from institutional leaders to work within and appropriately adapt the [RCM] system (p. 44).

The authors highlight the need for institutional leaders to measure and manage student affairs and costs in academic schools. Strauss and Curry (2002) warned against cases where academic schools, “flush with revenues and unhappy with student affairs, hire their own administrators to supplement student affair services they are already paying for in the allocated indirect costs” (p. 44). NABUCO (2013) reiterated this concern by stating:

Local optimization will come to dominate... [and create the] economic *tragedy of the commons*: If the sum of locally optimal decisions is not globally optimal, there

will be underinvestment in the common good. The key is whether the university share of revenues is sufficient to protect or enhance the commons...The natural and potentially creative tension between central and local perspectives and priorities often provides rich context for conversations about the common good. (p. 1).

The scenario is indicative of an “unresponsive central administration, where failure to recognize and correct a service problem denies economies of scale, and shifts costs to the deans who invoke local solutions” (Strauss & Curry, 2002, p. 44). Further, an ecological fallacy principle may exist where “initiatives to promote productivity of academic units largely overlook support units and have the counterproductive potential to promote undesirable behaviors that do not increase productivity at the institutional level” (Rhoades, 2001 p. 625). Contemporary literature suggests campus administration has a culture of affirming academic school decisions about curriculum expansion which may carry over to student affairs (Bugeja, 2012; Smart & John, 1996). Bugeja (2012) stated that the central administration may unintentionally exacerbate an affirming culture of academic school decisions within RCM.

The diffusion of centralized decision-making may enable academic schools and departments to create redundant services (Dill, 1984). Academic schools can intentionally or unintentionally create competitive services in a self-interpreted effort to educate and support students. Therefore, the relationship between academic deans and student affairs leadership is essential to understand. In the next section the concepts of RCM and the organizational constructs which are needed for its successful implementation are outlined using Whalen (1991).

Section II: Organizational Literature

In this section, the components of a healthy RCM system and related organization constructs are discussed. Researchers denote organizational qualities for the central administration, academic school, and student affairs leaders to maintain for a successful RCM model. To enhance the depth of the study, it is important to review the organizational concepts related to decentralization cross-referenced in the RCM literature. Student affairs leaders need to fully understand how to navigate the organizational concepts and dynamics which undergird an RCM system to work to support the institutional mission and the academic schools. Key concepts related to organizational decentralization include: size, ambiguity, loose-coupling, interdependence, duplication, and communication.

Size

Current organizational researchers, such as Morgan (2006), define a large public institution as an organization that “modifies the principles of centralized control to allow greater autonomy to staff and is appropriate for dealing with relatively stable conditions where tasks are relatively complicated” (p. 51). As previously highlighted, the major shifts in funding higher education have created an unstable fiscal environment. Large public institutions are faced with making more market driven decisions (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Making effective and accurate decisions is essential in environments where the conditions are unstable (Morgan, 2006). Priest and Boon (2006) described RCM through case studies of three large, public institutions. A discussion of RCM suggests that the budget system is ideal for large decentralized institutions with multiple

colleges and departments (Priest & Boon, p. 179). This study will include student affairs departments with multiple reporting units which are dependent on tuition dollars.

Ambiguity

The nature of academic schools and student affairs departments make clear roles difficult to articulate. Further, in student affairs departments, goals have been left ambiguous as a result of an array of functional areas (Cohen & March, 1986). However, role ambiguity may not be as negative as it sounds. “Role ambiguity may reflect situations where not all roles and connections among roles can, or should, be specified by the organization” (Bess & Dee, 2008, p. 266). Baldrige et al. (1977) suggested that institutions purposely engineer abstract departmental roles to “foster agreement and to avoid imminent conflict” (p. 3). Baldrige et al. (1977) pointed out conflict may arise between entities when attempts to lessen ambiguity are attempted. This conflict may or may not be exacerbated in a RCM system. One possible advantage of role ambiguity is increased creativity and adaptability for finding student success solutions. On the other hand, academic schools may lack an understanding of student affairs services and thus reproduce student affair functions (Kuk & Banning, 2009; Mason & Eldridge, 2010).

Loose-Coupling

In the context of organizations, Weick (1976) defined loose-coupling as “organizations and events that are responsive, but that also preserve their own identities and some evidence of physical and logical separateness” (p. 3). Goal ambiguity may also result in an organizational loose-coupling between academic schools and student affairs. The intentional lack of structure in a loosely-coupled institution may facilitate adaptation,

especially in uncertain fiscal environments. The word ‘coupling’ elicits an idea of connection between two or more academic schools and student affairs.

The advantage of autonomous, loosely-coupled organizations with ambiguous roles is that decision making is sensitive and responsive, enabling academic schools and student affairs to make collaborative but independent decisions (Bess & Dee, 2008; Gioia & Thomas 1996; Morgan, 2006; Whalen, 1991; Weick, 1976). Loose-coupling also enables functions within a large system to be modified because leaders have more discretion, self-determination, and self-efficacy in autonomous academic schools and student affairs than in a tightly-coupled system (Weick, 1976). Strauss and Curry (2002) warned, however, that too loose of a coupling may also create a lack of financial responsibility. Weick (1976) called for a strengths analysis which could include patterns and strengths between loosely-coupled academic schools and student affairs.

Interdependence

The interdependent relationship between student affairs and academic schools is a critical component of RCM system. As these schools and departments become more loosely-coupled, they typically act as “independent silos” with little contact between them (Bess & Dee, 2008). RCM may also play a key role in the lack of interdependence between academic schools and student affairs. What incentive would a department have to form interdependence with another department, when maintaining autonomy is incentivized financially? Morgan (2006) reflected that the academic school and student affairs’ control of their own area can be increased by reducing dependency on others. This is why academic school and student affairs departments “like to have their own pocket of resources” to reduce interdependency (p. 170). To further reinforce this point,

Bensimon, Neumann, and Birnbaum, (1989) suggested that academic school and student affairs leaders are exerting power and autonomy by controlling their allocation of resources. However, in an effort to maintain autonomy, student affairs leaders and academic deans may increase the chances for duplication of student affairs services.

Duplication

A concern raised by Dubeck (1984) is that students would be negatively impacted by schools' territorialism, unnecessary course production, and competition for students. Further, Dubeck (1984) warned that RCM budget allocations devalue a liberal education by reducing students' sampling of a wide variety of courses. Although Dubeck's article is a reflection and not an empirical study, it raises important and enduring questions related to the evaluation of RCM. Bess and Dee (2008) highlighted this sentiment and reported that the pressures and power dynamics between academic schools and student affairs are a reality in decentralized environments. Bess and Dee (2008) state that decentralized academic schools and student affairs which strive to be autonomous and adaptive to their distinctive local situation are predicated on the assumption that the central administration trusts internal efficiency given each area's budgetary limitations. Whalen (1991) outlined elements of a positive relationship between these institutional constituencies to create a healthy RCM system.

RCM Prerequisites

Given the embedded organizational challenges within large decentralized institutions, researchers have determined critical prerequisites for a successful RCM system. Whalen (1991) defines three groupings of constructs that are important to achieve an optimal RCM system: decision-making, motivation, and coordination.

First, RCM must support decision making with the concepts of proximity, knowledge, and proportionality. This trio of concepts focuses on the ability of academic deans and student affairs leaders to be closest to problems and challenges, to have the right amount of autonomy to make key decisions, and to access ample information to make decisions. The proximity to academic problems is essential for entrepreneurial decision making. The creativity and synergy between student affairs and academic schools can advance institutional goals when both entities have equal access to pertinent information. Entrepreneurial behavior, when done in a communicative environment with clear expectations, shared data, and a climate of governance, can thrive within bounds that do not impede institutional goals of both efficiency and effectiveness. The definition of entrepreneurship within student affairs and academics schools should incorporate an ethos of transparency and an ethical respect for shared governance that prohibits decision making which is a replication of existing student affairs services.

Whalen's (1991) second group of key concepts is related to motivation and includes functionality, performance recognition, and stability. These concepts discuss the distribution of authority given to RCM decision makers, the rewards for effective performance and penalties for ineffective performance, and the stability of the environment, i.e. lack of fluctuation in expectations. Whalen (1991) warned that in complex organizations one unit's performance may affect others motivation in very important ways. Attempting to strike a balance by assigning responsibility to one and control over resources or authority to another may force communication between areas but may not lead to effective performance. As an example, student affairs leaders may be challenged with moral issues due to "unfunded mandates" and expectations for services

without adequate resources as a non-revenue generating area (pp. 11-12). This situation can also result in instability within areas that do not have consistent revenue streams.

The fluctuation in expectations can further exacerbate a lack of motivation.

The third group of concepts for an effective RCM system relates to coordination, which includes community, leverage, and direction. These concepts are critical to this study. The philosophical approach and definition of community may have different interpretations for academic deans and student affairs leaders. Whalen (1991) suggested that community is the “relations of the parts to the whole and to one another has to be explicitly reflected in the assignment of responsibility and authority in the allocation of resources” (p. 12). This statement is important to understanding if student affairs leaders feel they can carry out their support to the university community with authority as they allocate resources.

Beyond authority is the concept of leverage and how it is used by the central administrations in maintaining institutional goals. Whalen (1991) maintained that “Certain services are needed for the collective benefit of the academic community and [are] provide[d] as public utilities” (p. 13). Strauss (2002) explained that RCM is a structure designed to balance academic entrepreneurship with fiscal responsibility without duplicating central utilities and services. Responsible institutional and academic growth are created when central rules and policies become leverage between entrepreneurial activity, public or central utilities, and institutional goals. RCM needs clear rules to ensure optimal decision making in the complex relationship. However, administrators may focus on the rules and not the end game, which may also distort RCMs efficiency focus for their own effectiveness goals regarding needed replication of

central utilities. Implications for this discussion are important for a revised commitment from the central administration to provide attentive management and govern expense by instituting new controls over academic colleges to prevent replication of central services such as student affairs functions (Curry, Laws, & Strauss, 2013; Priest & Boon, 2006).

Building on the clarity of rules, the final concept regarding coordination is a consistent and clear direction that is “mutually supportive of the academic and administrative plans for the institution” (Strauss, 2002, p. 13). A set of clear institutional goals are paramount to make the best decisions. How student affairs leaders interpret and prioritize their localized decision making in support of the institutional direction is the focus of this study. Whalen (1991) called for an overall director or intellectual champion that never loses focus on growth but not at the expense of the university model. If there is not a champion to create a clear direction, Strauss (2002) warned that subversion of RCM is likely to occur. As the central administration determines the allocation and level of student affairs services, it may need to exercise leverage if academic schools duplicate these services or more control if services are not meeting academic deans’ goals. Further, some academic schools, often based on resources, might duplicate services while others become more dependent.

Student affairs leaders’ may or may not think of themselves as these champions and coordinators of clear and consistent goals as they make decisions that are either in coordination with institutional priorities and or academic schools. The central administration’s identification of institutional priorities through strategic planning sessions may assist student affairs and academic deans’ understanding of coordination. Without these efforts, student affairs may be left to interpret these

priorities without clear direction. Further, student affairs leaders and academic deans may create different priorities. An academic dean could replicate a central utility in an effort to meet a localized or individual priority not part of the overall institutional priority. Stocum and Rooney (1997) suggested:

RCM neither creates nor destroys dollars; its effectiveness as a tool depends upon the skills of the people using it. Campus administrators and deans must collaborate in establishing a congruence of vision, values, and goals across all levels of the university, so that the individual academic [and student affairs] units are forged into a coherent whole. (p. 56)

When a campus employs decision making, motivation, and coordination prerequisites for an optimal RCM system, it removes the need for the central administration to give favor, carte-blanc approval, and/or prioritize academic schools (Whalen, 1991). Varlotta (2010) emphasized these by calling on student affairs leaders to “proactively make transparent the many connections that tie their own programs and services to the academic mission and priorities of the university” (p. 97). It is paramount that student affairs leaders position their work as central utilities. This requires active and aggressive leaders. This point articulates that central student affairs services needs a vigilant and strong central administration to be a watchdog for academic growth that could subvert central utilities.

The final directional concept for a successful RCM implementation is a planned refreshment of institutional priorities, rules, and budget planning which takes into account the embedded challenges of a RCM system. Strauss (2002) warned that “subventions are not self-correcting” (p. 35). As intended and unintended subversions of RCM will occur, a planned review or audit of decisions can help realign budget decisions and the overall commitment to RCM.

Whalen (1991) agreed that decentralized management can lead to greater departmental autonomy. However, he warned that a “perversion of principles” may occur when academic school and student affairs leaders overestimate their autonomy (p. 150). The lack of interdependence or reliance upon one another and the absence of common rules and regulations to govern student affairs departments may allow for duplication of job functions and services. Kaplan (2006) suggested that established rules, procedures, and distributions of authority influence how stakeholders make decisions. The absence of integration and interdependence may be intensified if more divisions of labor are created through new units of academic schools and student affairs (Bess & Dee, 2008; Giddens, 1979).

Student affairs leaders’ understanding of the organizational context and constructs, as well as the balance of priorities, roles, and tactics is important to the considerations necessary for making critical decisions within a RCM environment.

It is vital for SSAOs who serve in such institutions to play a central role in conceptualizing and implementing the university’s strategic plan and to use that plan as the cornerstone for divisional documents that highlight mission, vision, and values. If the budget truly serves as the financial representation of the strategic plan, then resources will follow the plan’s priorities in both prosperous times and tight years alike. When SSAOs map those priorities in specific and concrete ways back to the division, they almost guarantee their departments some financial support (Varlotta, 2010, p.7).

However, there is little empirical data concerning the direction of student affairs decisions. In this next section, the organizational concepts will be further explored using organizational literature regarding large complex decentralized organizations.

Section III: Student Affairs Literature

This section outlines the current state of student affairs, particularly how student affairs leaders are choosing to navigate tough fiscal situation on their campuses. As there is no specific literature regarding how student affairs leaders navigate an RCM system, opinion pieces and a few related studies will be used to gain insights into how student affairs leaders make decisions.

Recent literature claims the work of student affairs personnel is important for supporting student retention, persistence, and success (Porterfield, Roper, & Whitt, 2011; Scott & Bischoff, 2000, Torres & Walbert, 2010). Contrarily, a criticism of student affairs departments is that their work is peripheral to the educational mission of the institution, and is thus non-essential (Schuh & Gansemer-Topf, 2010). A common institutional view point is student affairs roles and responsibilities are traditionally relegated to providing for the needs of students and administrative functions secondary to the teaching and the research role of the academy (Engstrom & Tinto, 2000). This perception places student affairs in a financially vulnerable position in budget decisions (Hearn et al., 2006; Priest & Boon, 2006). Nevertheless, the current fiscal situation may enable student affairs to revisit, reshape, and revitalize its mission and purpose and therefore its place of priority in the institution (Manning & Kinzie, (2006). These differences in perception may place student affairs in a financially vulnerable position (Hearn et al., 2006, Priest & Boon, 2006; Schuh & Gansemer-Topf, 2010).

Student affairs departments are non-revenue generating entities, and thus are completely dependent on two sources for funding: general allocation from the university budget and fundraised dollars. Recent observations on the climate of finance and higher

education indicate that student affairs departments are adding to their revenue sources by growing fundraising programs (Boverini, 2005; Crowe, 2011; Morgan, & Policello, 2010). This suggests that the budgeted amount from the central administration is not meeting student affairs needs. As student affairs departments are mostly dependent on revenue from central administration via academic schools it is important to understand the literature regarding student affairs department management within these contexts. Hearn, Lewis, Kallsen, Holdsworth, and Jones (2006) echoed this by sharing that the effects of RCM on funding central services and student affairs department priorities may be of concern.

Given the funding crisis of higher education, student affairs is increasingly required to fulfill their mission with fewer resources (Ardaiole, 2010; Romano, Hanish, Phillips, & Waggoner, 2009). The Romano et al. (2009) study examined the management techniques used to navigate the budget and planning of student affairs. The study reviewed 12 state-supported public universities from 1999-2009 in which 12 senior student affairs officers were asked to reflect on the strategies and management of budget cuts. The responses included: reorganize departments, eliminate positions, and revisit and emphasize the alignment of the student affairs mission with the institutional mission. Additionally, student affairs reported they are “seize[ing] the moment to achieve new organizational objectives” (p. 62). However, it is unclear if student affairs objectives are in alignment with academic schools, institutional priorities, or both.

Institutional Mission

Student affairs leaders may or may not be responsive to institutional and/or academic school mission, vision, and values. Varlotta (2010) stated that it is vital for

student affairs leaders to “play a central role in conceptualizing and implementing the university strategic plan and to use that plan as a cornerstone for divisional documents that highlight mission, vision, and values” (p. 6). Torres and Walbert’s (2010) recent task force report is a seminal work which incorporated the views of 16 senior student affairs leaders. They emphasized the need to remain focused on the institutional mission stating, “Mission matters” (p. 13). Varlotta (2010) concluded that central administration will not “hold institutional activities harmless during budget crisis,” and therefore, it is paramount that student affairs proactively make connections that tie services to both the institutional as well as the academic missions and priorities of the university (p. 8). These priorities may be in conflict with one another.

The literature on student affairs suggests there can be a distinction between academic and institution mission, vision, and priorities. Porter (2013) called for an examination of relative and joint priorities between student affairs, academic schools, and the institutional mission, but warn that academic school priorities typically take precedent when they are also aligned with institutional mission. Harrison’s (2010) participatory research study examined six student affairs professionals operating in large university systems. Student affairs professionals cited conflict in choosing loyalty between student advocacy and upper-level administrator’s priorities. This suggests that student affairs professionals may be in a struggle which could result in “serious consequences as they attempt to challenge systems in advocacy efforts” (p. 212). The results support the finding by Deanna (2001) that student affairs professionals serve as a “voice for students,” while worrying about both professional risks, departmental reputations, and resource acquisition.

The decision-making process for student affairs leaders may pose significant challenges as they decide loyalties between serving students or other constituencies. Realistic budget requests may distort services (Barr, 2002). Effective student affairs leaders make values-based decisions that may or may not be consistent with prevailing student affairs values and mission. But what if student affairs services are in conflict with academic priorities? Levy (1995) bemoaned that if fiscal priorities for student affairs departments did not improve, some of the core functions would have to be funded by the students themselves. Ardaiole (2010), using a narrative design, described the complex issues and choices student affairs leaders utilized in “actualizing the institution’s core values, governing principles, and ground rules that would direct the content and process of the decision-making” (p. 72). Ardaiole (2010) maintained the first priority is the institutional mission. Varlotta (2010) agreed that the first and foremost priority is for student affairs leaders’ to support the university’s mission and strategic plans. This theme illustrates the need for student affairs leaders to align their work as both a fundable and an essential central service.

Academic Adaptation

Recent literature also calls for student affairs leaders to adapt and align services with academic priorities which may be necessary to gain needed resources within a RCM system. Student affairs leaders must consider if academic priorities and plans are more relevant to the changing environment than that of the institutional plans (Varlotta, 2010; Schuch, 2003). In a robust meta-analysis, Banning and Kuk (2009) reviewed dissertations that focus on student affairs’ organizational issues in an era of fiscal crisis. An inductive analysis of the topic highlighted that student affairs leaders are restructuring

their decisions in support of academic school, institutional values, and in collaboration of both needs. They determined that academic school strategic plans may be more effective adaptations to environmental change than those of the institution strategic plans.

Academic and Institutional Values

Student affairs leaders may utilize a complementary and collaborative strategy of aligning academic, institutional, and student advocacy values (Gansemer-Topf & Englin, 2015; Dungy, 2003; Kuk & Banning, 2009). Data and sense-making are key to this process, which not only addresses student needs but also academic college goals (Bensimon, 2005; Gioia & Thomas 1996; Murray, 2000). Student affairs departments that fully understand academic college priorities can anticipate and form collaborative programs in support of students at the local academic level (Banta & Kuh, 1998). Morgan (2006) emphasized a refocus of energy by embedding larger academic and institutional philosophies as a step towards interdependence. A case study by Porterfield, Roper, and Whitt (2011) called for student affairs leaders to adapt their “services to support student achievement and institutional missions and creating programs and environments outside the classroom to complement students’ experiences in the curriculum” (p. 2). This literature points to balancing of both institutional and academic needs.

The Torres and Walbert (2010) report suggested student affairs departments are in a unique position to partner between academic schools systems and structures stating:

“breaking down internal silos, while critical, is not enough. As an example, the dire fiscal challenges facing higher education may offer opportunities for student affairs departments to rethink their alignment with the institutional mission and academic school priorities and to create a flattened organizational structure. The mobility of students and the diversity of their experiences require a rethinking of the nature of student affairs collaborations” (p.9).

Porterfield, Roper, and Whitt (2011) stated new adaptive and effective student affairs organizational designs and structures are needed. In this study, “76% responded,” stating they had made moderate changes to their departments because of financial concerns, strategic priorities, efficiencies and effectiveness, collaboration, and flattened organization decision-making (p .2). The authors added that creating structures that have fewer specialties and organizing practice according to shared mission and purposes will help support more complexity and more diverse students and add value for faculty. Scott and Bischoff (2000) in a single case study suggested that student affairs departments at one institution reduced small individual offices, crossed academic and Manning, and created a synergy and economy of scale. Also, the institution developed more formal linkages with academic school and student affairs departments which allowed for the greater “seamless transitions” students desired and reduced college-wide the number of repetitive transactions, which bore a “significant cost” (p. 126). As higher education’s fiscal challenges may force student affairs leaders to reduce budgets they may be more like to adapt their decisions in support of academic schools’ priorities. In order to achieve this level of cooperation, student affairs and academic schools’ leaders must communicate well.

Communication and Collaboration

Kuk and Banning (2009) reported that the complexity and the specialization of functions were necessary to communicate and collaborate across academic school and student affairs departments boundaries in order to create “greater efficiency” (p. 101). Mason and Eldridge (2010) explained student affairs need to create a comprehensive communication plan to inform academic school and central administration leaders of the

importance of student affairs departments' work. The findings stress the importance of understanding the institutional budget context and key aspects of developing a comprehensive communication plan. Ardaiole (2010) recommended that SSAOs establish relationships with all other academic school deans and central administration and that there is a collection as well as dissemination of relevant data to substantiate any requests or arguments against strategy. Data may be the missing link in the perceived gap between understanding and supporting student affairs departments as part of a fundable student affairs. A common theme of academic and student affairs collaboration is communication.

Strategic planning and budgetary processes and plans are how institutions of higher education express their values. Institutional leadership must be studied as this group spends a significant amount of time on research, strategy development, and negotiation of the guiding principles for budget and planning processes (Evans, 2011). Colleges and universities as a whole have been noted as being better at research and teaching than making strategic decisions (Kotler & Murphy, 1981). Strategic decision-making of student affairs services "remain relatively unconsidered" (Rhoades, 2001, p. 626). Student affairs leaders understand both the problems and the priorities of the institution. This understanding in turn helps student affairs become more adept at garnering resources for the programs and priorities that will either be consistent with the values and goals or be a conscious trade off (Ardaiole, 2010; Banning & Kuh, 2009; Harrison, 2010; Varlotta, 2010).

Section IV: Decision Making Models

To help examine how student affairs leaders make decisions, this study will utilize Chaffee's (1983, 1985) management decision making strategies. Chaffee's (1983, 1985) develop the theoretical model to analyze the strategic decisions of higher education presidents. Applying this theoretical lens to student affairs leaders in different institutions, I will attempt to understand how leaders respond to their institutional environment created as a result of a RCM budget model. Chaffee created a dichotomy between two management decision-making frameworks. The study will investigate if student affairs leaders display similarities decision making frameworks. One example may be if student affairs leadership adapt to challenging fiscal times by building partnerships with academic schools in an effort to gain more resources (Engstrom & Tinto, 2000; Lovell & Kosten, 2000).

Adaptive and Constructive Models

First, Chaffee's (1983) Adaptive Decision-making model suggests that new or changing decision-making strategies are required to acquire the outside resources in response to changes in the external environment. An institution relying heavily on adaptive decision making will be more sensitive to external constituencies in times of growth and/or maintenance of resources. As an example, student affairs may build a collaboration with an academic school(s) such as assisting with teaching courses. As a result, student affairs staff spend a portion of their time creating curriculum and teaching. In return, student affairs may gain perceived and actual compensation for supporting an academic schools teaching mission. However, the cost may impact student affairs' ability to provide other needed service to students. Student affairs' direct support of

teaching course for an academic school may be an example of Chaffee's adaptation theory of decision making.

Second, Chaffee's (1983) Constructive Decision-making model is based on the concept that management strategies are created from within the institution and not through adaption to external pressures or resources dependency. This is a social constructivist model where meaning is made by the organization from within itself including its history and traditions. Social constructivism holds a philosophical perspective that an organization is created out of personal past and present shared experiences. In this model, the mission, purpose, and decisions of the organization are only internally created and maintained. The leadership of the organization can create new initiatives but only if they fit within the parameters of the values and mission of the organization. Student affairs in a tough budgetary year may decide to collapse positions to try and maintain services versus exploring new resources that may add positional tasks outside of the department's scope of responsibility.

Chaffee (1983) examined presidential leadership overseeing organizations in times of crisis and change. The Chaffee study relied on the dichotomy between these two decision-making strategies to categorize how institutional leaders, i.e. presidents, made decisions to sustain their institutions in a volatile environment. Institutions in the study made decisions such as changing academic programs and recruitment initiatives in challenging fiscal environments. Chaffee found that the presidents most likely responded to external pressures and internal politics which justified their strategic decision making patterns. Chaffee determined that in most cases successful presidential leadership maintained a constructive viewpoint in their decision-making strategies. It will be useful

to ascertain if student affairs leaders in challenging fiscal times maintain a constructivist perspective or position their organization and adapt to try and gain more resources.

Pfeffer and Salancik's (1978) theory of Resource Dependency is the basis for Chaffee's (1983) Adaptive and Constructive models. Chaffee determined that Resource Dependency Theory is when changes inside the organizations are caused by a dependency on an external resource required for the organization's existence. In a resource-dependent model, an institution will make decisions to adapt and change internal functions to best position itself to access critical revenue from external sources. When the revenue for these academic and student affairs areas are reduced or no longer available, the organization is disrupted and becomes more sensitive to external resources (Leslie et al., 2002). In this situation, student affairs leaders may be forced to make difficult decisions. As an example, student affairs leaders may use an adaptive decision making model and develop fundraising efforts to augment their budgets. Another adaptive example may be student affairs teaching courses for an academic school in an attempt to gain resources in terms of social and financial capital.

Both models incorporate a sensitivity to external resources. However, in adaptive decision-making, management decisions are made regardless of the institution's values and mission. In the constructive model, management decisions are only implemented if the internal values and mission of the institution are met. In order for a student affairs leader to implement a constructive decision-making model, they must not only understand, appreciate, and embody the mission and purpose of the institution, but also must be sensitive to the interpretation of the campus history and traditions. In the prior example, student affairs staff may choose not to teach courses for academic schools

because they determine that it will negatively impact student affairs services. Chaffee (1983, 1985) warned that if leaders do not act with integrity regarding the values and mission of student affairs, they very “well make the wrong decisions” (p. 24). The Adaptive decision-making model would change student affairs services. While both models are sensitive to external resources, SSAOs who employ the Adaptive model are more willing to make decisions in order to guarantee external resources. In the Adaptive model, the institutional value and mission is a secondary priority to acquiring scarce resources.

As the literature on student affairs leaders indicates, the field is impacted by external financial pressures. As student affairs budgets may be more susceptible to reductions during a financial crisis, it is important that student affairs leaders understand a decision-making framework to guide their units, especially in a budgeting system that limits central control of financial resources.

Student affairs leaders may adhere to either an Adaptive or a Constructive model to lead their departments. As student affairs at large public institutions is decentralized, a single campus study will examine if similar student affairs departments under the same or comparable internal and external pressures employ the same decision-making theory to guide their strategic plans and functions. As RCM is becoming more popular with large public institutions, a focus of this study will be the perceptions of student affairs leaders in how they interpret their decision making strategies. Do student affairs leaders use Adaptive or Constructive or a hybrid of both in their decision making, and how do these leaders perceive and interpret their decisions?

Conclusion

The privatization and corporatization of public higher education institutions have been implemented due to a reduction in the portion of state funding. As a result, some institutions have moved to incentive-based budgeting systems such as RCM to focus on revenue generation and cost reduction. The characteristics of a RCM system impact how academic schools and student affairs departments approach budgeting and planning. This literature review examined the relationship between student affairs departments and academic schools within the RCM budget and planning system.

The current literature suggests that central utilities such as student affairs requires special treatment within a RCM environment. Whalen (1991) warned that without close attention to the design of appropriate cost-sharing mechanisms to fund non-revenue generating academic school and student affairs departments, a RCM system may not function as intended. Priest and Boon (2006) added that non-revenue generating student affairs departments' budgets call for "careful management" and "accountability to academic constituencies in the use of scarce resources" (p. 183).

The lack of institutional coordination and/or lack of student affairs departments' sensitivity to institutional needs may lead to a decrease in integration and interdependence, causing some academic schools to view the student affairs departments as inefficient, costly, and duplicative. If duplication exists, student affairs departments may be called into question by important stakeholders, both external and internal (i.e., trustees, administrators, and academic school deans). Current literature suggests student affairs departments should consider a review of their services and practices in order to create more interdependency and even integration in an effort to limit duplication. A

central administration, in conjunction with student affairs department leaders, should carefully plan to “address system-wide needs of internal efficiency in accordance with budgetary limitations” (Bess & Dee, 2008, p. 194). As such, student affairs services may or may not be appreciated and institutionally valued as central services.

The gap in the literature regarding the perceptions of student affairs officers’ includes the relationship to and awareness of academic department’s value of student affairs as an interdependent central and essential service (Banta & Kuh, 1988). Schuh and Gansemer-Topf (2010) suggested student affairs officers develop more extensive research and assessment practices so they can become more effective partners in the educational process. As an example, benchmarking was suggested as a possible solution to determine if the “central service providers are running an efficient operation when compared to peers” (Evans, 2011, p. 109). Current literature suggests that orientation with the institutional mission, restructuring, assessment, and communication are helpful management approaches for student affairs leaders. As RCM systems become more popular and as resources allocation and requisitions become increasingly competitive, it may be essential for student affairs officers to learn how to manage inside these environments.

This study will explore the perceptions of how student affairs leaders make decisions in a RCM environment. Chaffee’s (1983) Adaptive and Constructive models of strategic decision making will create a framework for the initial analysis of the data. Student affairs leaders have noted that years of budget cutting has forced them to reexamine the value and purpose of student affairs (Ardaiolo, 2010; Barr, 2002; Harrison, 2010; Varlotta, 2010). As an example, budget cutting strategies may suggest an adaptive

approach to decision making if it limits student affairs services based on enduring values of supporting student's success (Barr, 2002; Deanna, 2001; Harrison, 2010). However, other insights into the perceptions of student affairs leaders' decision-making strategies may emerge from the data. The qualitative research methodology employed in this study may uncover new concepts or models and increase the need for further inquiry.

The next chapter will detail the research methodology, study sample, and data-collection design. This study utilizes the previously discussed research to examine how student affairs professionals at a single campus perceive their environment and make decisions for their departments. How do they work within the challenges of a RCM environment? How do student affairs understand the centralized services' purpose and function in relation to academic schools that may need centralized services or that may be providing their own? In particular, the study will determine if there are patterns in decision-making strategies for student affairs leaders. The next chapter will provide details on the research methodology, the study sample, and the data-collection design.

Chapter III: Research Methods

This chapter explores the possible approaches to research how student affairs leaders make decisions in a RCM budget and planning environment. Currently, there is limited empirical research in this area. Therefore, an inductive process is used in conjunction with tested frameworks. The framework and theory are garnered from prior research focused on resource dependency (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978) and decision making theory (Chaffee, 1983 & 1985; Mintzberg 1973; Wieck, 1976). The application of these theories and reliable research methods builds a new understanding of decision making of student affairs leaders working in a RCM environment and also a stronger case in favor of continued empirical research.

This chapter also explores the motivation of the researcher and provides an overview of the study, including research questions, relevant research traditions informing the study, research framework, and methodological approach. The research design includes a discussion of the “self as instrument” dynamic, research sample, data-collection methods, ethical questions, plans for validity, a discussion of the study’s limitations, and proposed data analysis.

Motivation

The primary purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of how and why student affairs leaders make decisions as they relate to budget or RCM budget model. The reason for pursuing this study is to understand effective and strategic management in my work environment. Taking on this study adds to my knowledge and skills as a student affairs professional and has the potential to inform other student affairs professionals.

In addition to personal applications, this study expands knowledge for the student affairs profession. It is my hope that student affairs practitioners and scholars use this study both for continued research and for practical application to lead student affairs departments and units within RCM budgeting systems. The application of the conceptual framework (Decision Making Theory) may be used within student affairs preparation programs as a simple and useful model for how decisions are made within campus RCM models. This study will shed light on how student affairs leaders make the case for improvement. When student affairs decisions are consistent with the values of the institution in a manner that insures budget development for quality services, student affairs is able to justify its' significance as a central utility.

Overview of Study

The purpose of this study is to understand how student affairs leaders make decisions in a RCM budget and planning environment. The emphasis on examining the decisions made by student affairs leaders who operate under the control of the central administration is to understand the philosophical and strategic approaches that may or may not be effected by a campus responsibility centered management budget and planning system. This research explores if there are commonalities among student affairs leaders within like RCM systems with response to decisions they make using either an Adaptive or a Constructive model of decision making. Chaffee's (1983) Dyadic Management Strategy model is used as an analytical filter to understand why student affairs leaders propose, plan, and implement intentional decision making.

Research Questions

The questions guiding the research process are pertinent to examining student affair leaders' perceptions of working in an RCM environment. The following research questions are pertinent to examining student affairs leaders' at large public research university perceptions of their decision making as they work surrounded by their RCM environments.

1. How do student affairs leaders at large public research universities perceive their decision making as they work within RCM environments?
 - a. What are student affairs leaders' perceptions of how their services are valued by the central administration and academic school leadership within a RCM model?
 - b. Do student affairs leaders believe that a RCM model affects the qualities of organizational decision-making strategies?
 - c. If so, how and to what extent are decision-making strategies effected?
2. In what way does RCM influence how student affairs leaders' position and or prioritize decision making in the acquisition of campus resources?
3. To what extent does a RCM model effect how student affairs are structured and delivered?
4. To what extent does student affairs organizational decision making support academic schools and the institutional mission and goals?
5. In your tenure, has student affairs organizational decision making strategies changed as a result of the RCM budgeting model? If so how?

As large research public institutions are becoming more reliant on tuition revenue and RCM is growing in popularity, a multiple site case study approach will be implemented. By comparing two public research institutions' data, the researcher will determine if there are significant similarities in student affairs leader's decision-making strategies between comparable institutions.

Research Tradition

The research approach and model utilized in this study is a constructivist perspective. This model is useful in understanding the breadth and depth of various responses to how student affairs leaders' make or prioritize decisions. The analysis of their decisions provides an understanding of the nature of collective responses which are used to gain a better understanding of how student affairs leaders navigate an RCM budget environment.

This study distills the perception of student affairs' socially constructed relationships through the decisions made by student affairs leaders. The study asks participants to reflect on their institutional function and practice within their current reality and over time. As Patton (2002) said, one of the most important forms of institutional evaluation is "people, people, people," emphasizing that a keen understanding and explanation of a situation is the socially constructed meaning between individuals. Analysis of the shared experiences of student affairs leaders based on their personal reality, as it relates to budget decision making strategies, will utilize a constructivist approach to undergird the qualitative research model. The socially constructed knowledge built between the researcher and the subject is an essential part of the methodology.

Proposed Methodology

The methodological perspective assumes and justifies a process for uncovering and attaining knowledge (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Within the attainment of knowledge, there are ontological and epistemological assumptions which shape the way the respondents answer the questions being studied. Again, informed by a constructivist approach, the epistemology of the research and researcher holds that the “the investigator and the object of the investigation are assumed to be interactively linked so that the ‘findings’ are literally created as the investigation proceeds” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 111). Therefore, to uncover and understand student affairs decision making, it is important for the researcher to be in close proximity and to deeply understand the internal and external context impacting the assumptions which effect knowledge (Crotty, 1998). As Patton (2002) stated, a relational and personal approach to qualitative methodology allows for unearthing issues both complex and detailed through the use of a general but flexible form of query. Interviews can be dynamic, but still provide results that can be categorized. As data is aggregated, the patterns or absence of patterns which develop as part of this study can provide a convincing argument for how student affairs leaders navigate their RCM environment while making decisions.

Methodological Challenges

This close and internal methodical approach does come with imbedded challenges. First, each student affairs leader may have differing personal and political ideologies. As such, it is important to understand the underlying motivation of the decision when analyzing how student affairs leaders decide priorities. The gathering of these perceptions cannot develop into absolute truth. “No construction is or can be

incontrovertibly right; advocates of any particular construction must rely on persuasiveness and utility rather than proof in arguing their position” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 108). Guba and Lincoln (1994) concluded that the intangible mental processes and constructs of individuals as well as groups are things that can be reliably studied and categorized but are not absolutes.

Second, the methodological problem is subjectivity and bias on the part of the researcher. As this methodology is based on the communication between researcher and respondent, there may be embedded limitations that need to be minimized. The researcher’s personal paradigm undergirds the research that is proposed. The knowledge and understanding of the researcher’s belief system is vital to review before entering into the proposed research. To engineer clarity and moderate bias, the study includes a review of Guba and Lincoln’s (1994) ontological and epistemological approaches that make up a person’s belief system (p. 107). Guba and Lincoln (1994) describe the constructivist paradigm as being relative (ontological), subjective (epistemological), as well as subjectivist and transactional (methodological) (pp. 110-111). Each of these perspectives will be further explored.

Ontological Perspective

How student affairs leaders set priorities depends on the ontological views of the decision maker. The student affairs leader’s view of reality directly influences the personal process of evaluating necessary efforts to gain more resources and to positively affect the department’s mission. An ontological perspective affirms that social relationships are constantly emerging. This affirmation requires an individual observer to sense and label social observations in an attempt to navigate one’s environment. This

perspective focuses on providing a description and categorization of socially constructed relationships instead of claiming certainty from findings. The description of student affairs leaders' decision-making priorities heavily influences the outcome of this study. An understanding of how respondents construct their social reality, in conjunction with an accommodation of the researcher's perspective, needs to be balanced in the collection and interpretation of the data.

Epistemological Perspective

The epistemological perspective of the researcher in relationship to the knowledge or the data being sought is another important consideration (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). As student affairs leaders discuss motivations and priorities, the meaning they attach to the events and symbols of those decisions will be their socially constructed experience. As knowledge is constantly created and recreated in social settings, the interpretation of these experiences is best described by the student affairs leaders closest to those who make the decisions. Further, the researcher's interpretation of these decisions needs to be governed closely to reduce contamination of the data and findings. How the researcher will reduce this effect will be discussed in the Ethical Considerations and Trustworthiness section. But, first the methodological research design will be highlighted.

Case Study Design

The empirical literature in the study of RCM favors case studies. (Baldrige, 1971; Clark, 1960, 2004; Selznick, 1966). The choice of case study is usually selected to explore a phenomenon lasting for an uncertain period of time (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2011). As this study proposes to investigate two sites over a flexible period of time, the multi-site case study design is a useful and suitable framework for making meaning. Case

study was chosen as the primary methodology because the interaction between the researcher and the respondents will rely on the socially constructed meaning of both the context and the respondent's behavior (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Case study design facilitates the examination of how and why student affairs leaders prioritize the needs of the department, faculty, and students. The multi-site case study design is also complementary to a social constructivist or interpretive model.

When studying a student affairs department from a social constructivist view, researchers should focus on the people who are involved in making decisions. As Patton (2002) suggested, in order to understand a situation or case study one must understand the people within the organization. While other elements of the organization such as websites and year end reports are used for context development, the interview portion of the case study provides the most meaning about student affairs leaders' decision making. The comparisons between case studies will assist the researcher to develop final conclusions.

Research Sample

An analysis of two institutions or cases provides an opportunity to understand and evaluate the differences and similarities between student affairs leaders' decisions. In addition to institutions, the case study design captures information that has loose boundaries of a time period and of a large subjects (Creswell, 1977). To increase the value of the interviews, the institutions are chosen utilizing relevant criteria concerning institutional type, student affairs department make-up, and RCM system implementation. These three criteria increase the opportunity to interpret and compare the value of decisions made by student affairs leaders (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Unfortunately,

varying pressures and priorities impacting institutions may not be able to be controlled such as state appropriation changes and large student affairs donations.

In choosing institutions and research subjects, I seek out two large public research institutions within the same geographic area and with similar missions, size, class profiles, and athletic conference. To maintain consistency, institutions with similar external fiscal climates are chosen: a dramatic decline in state appropriations proportionate to their overall budgets. Additionally, I examine leaders with similar positions who supervise similar student affairs functions and portfolios. Differences that may impact the study are noted. The following factors also inform the sample decision: how long institutions have hosted an RCM budgetary model and the time student affairs leaders managed and led their departments within this model. All student affairs leaders who are selected must have been in their current position for more than five years and at an institution with a fully implemented RCM for more than five years to guarantee in-depth knowledge of leading within the RCM environment and any substantive changes to their decision-making strategies during their tenure. This selection process may strengthen and focus the findings on describing the perspectives and possible patterns of student affairs leaders' decisions which "cut across a great deal of [organizational and environmental] variation" (Patton, 2002, p. 235).

Within the multi-campus case study, three to four student affairs leaders are selected to be interviewed. As student affairs department are organized differently, one senior student affairs leader is interviewed as well as two to three other seasoned student affairs peers and or subordinate leaders on each of the two campuses. Data interpretation and analysis is strengthened when "looking for patterns, putting together what is said in

one place with what is said in another place, and integrating what different people have said” (Patton, 2002, p. 381). These additional leaders are selected if they assist in the strategy making process of student affairs operations. Creswell (1997) suggested that in case studies, one “employs maximum variation as a strategy to represent diverse cases to fully display multiple perspectives about the case” (p. 120). The multiple perspectives of student affairs employees garner a more accurate portrait of student affairs decisions.

The next section will incorporate this discussion and review the research design.

Research Design

The following is a list of the main components in the proposed research design:

1. A review of literature is conducted in the areas of current context of privatization of public higher education, RCM budgeting systems, relevant higher education organizational theories and dynamics, current context of student affairs decision making, and Chaffee’s (1983) Decision Making Theory (Chapter 2.).
2. After defending the proposal, the research protocol and questions for approval from the IRB are submitted (see Appendix A.).
3. Potential subjects are personally contacted and upon conditional approval, sent a preliminary solicitation to participate. A letter is sent outlining the study, confidentiality agreement, and timeframe. Finally, the interviews are scheduled (see Appendix B.).
4. Programmatic data is obtained from each institution to understand the growth or decline of programs. Year-end reports and current website data are used for additional assessment.
5. Interviews are conducted with three to four senior student affairs leaders from each of the two institutions. The interview protocol directs the data collection (see Appendix C.).
6. Finally, the interview data is analyzed within and between the institutions.

Data Collection

From this research design list, the primary source of information is from interviews. The interviews are with student affairs leaders or administrators within the two institutions who create, augment, and implement decision making for the student affairs department. The use of qualitative interviews assumes these individuals have the

contextual and specific knowledge to answer all of the research questions, including those concerning the meaning of past and present decisions (Patton, 2002). The interview questions are designed to clearly establish the perspectives and motivations of the respondents. An important note is that institutions will not have the same implementation of RCM nor will they have the same organization of student affairs. Therefore, it will be important for the researcher to discuss these limitations in the data analysis. The interview questions are expected to substantiate an adaptive or constructive pattern, if one exists.

Student affairs leaders' perceptions of how deans perceive the mission and purpose of student affairs may shed light on the existence of a connected or interdependent relationship between student affairs and an academic school or schools. As the interviews progress, the perspectives of the respondents become a collective story or case for the researcher to categorize.

Informed Consent

Prior to the interview, a study information sheet will be provided to each student affairs leader for review (see Appendix D). The following information is included (as well as informed consent and confidentiality agreements) (Patton, 2002, p. 407):

1. The purpose of collecting the information is to better understand how student affairs leaders make decisions at institutions using RCM models.
2. The information is for an Indiana University Bloomington doctoral dissertation.
3. The interview consists of questions regarding the student affairs leaders' motivations and prioritizations of strategic decisions in the context of an RCM budget environment.
4. The responses will be recorded. All direct quotes and paraphrased statements will remain confidential. Neither the staff member nor the institution will be named. Institutions will be labeled as Midwest University (MWU) and Northwest University (NWU). NMU = the coded name of the institution, and a #1 = the student affairs leader. When referring to a specific student affairs leader, numbers will be used for the hierarchy of student affairs leader responding. If hierarchical

- roles are shared, then whoever is interviewed first will be assigned #1, #2, #3, etc.).
5. The respondents may decline to be interviewed and/or may skip any question they feel is a risk to maintaining confidentiality.

As part of the interview protocol, the interviews are recorded and transcribed. As I conduct this process, four steps are incorporated in the analysis of the interview data. Data analysis will not be performed independently of the data collection. Creswell (2003) offered that data analysis is “an ongoing process involving continual reflection about the data, asking analytic questions” (p. 190). The following three phases of the data analysis will be ongoing and repeated to produce phase four.

Data analysis phase 1, Review of Year-End Reports and Websites.

As Patton (2002) pointed out, the first phase of data analysis requires information gathering to become an informed researcher. Sources that provide contextual knowledge of the institutions include year-end student affairs reports and website content. Review of these sources assists in understanding past student affairs leaders’ work regarding programs, services, and relationships, which assists with the interview process (Maxwell, 2005).

Data analysis phase 2, Interviews

The second phase of data analysis is dedicated to reviewing the transcriptions of the respondents’ interviews. Patton (2002) encouraged analysis during the interview process to allow themes to emerge and to most accurately describe the phenomenon taking place. Once the interviews are transcribed, they will also be reviewed by the interviewee. This will allow errors in the initial analysis to be identified and corrected (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Data analysis phase 3, Multi-site Case Study Analysis

Phase three consists of a review of data and all notes to create categories, themes, and patterns to identify similarities (Marshall & Rossman, 1995). In preparation for the discussion of the findings, the categories and patterns will be identified and coded (Creswell, 1997). The interviews from each student affairs department will identify whether the priorities and decisions of the leaders are either adaptive or constructive in nature. The systematic coding of responses will be essential to build an understanding of themes and patterns while operating in an RCM environment. Data that is not useful in the final analysis will also be grouped and logged for later review or it may be discarded if it is determined that it is not relevant. Finally, a thorough description of the case and its context will be developed including the patterns presented and codes assigned (Creswell, 1997).

Data analysis phase 4, Multi-site Case Study.

The fourth and final phase will be the data analysis. The data will be filtered through the conceptual framework to make meaning of the similar categories, themes, and patterns which emerged from the data. This meaning-making process will rely most heavily on the interview portion of the case study. The analytical approach will use responders' explanation of why they prioritized and made decisions (Yin, 2009). This explanation will be the main focus of the narrative and therefore will be a significant portion of the multi-site case study (Yin, 2009). The process for interpreting the data will use Creswell's (1997) methodical design. First, the data will be classified into categories and then into potential patterns. Second, the direct interpretations will be made using naturalistic generalization, and finally a representation of the data will use tables and

figures to aid in the interpretation of the data and the following discussion. Before any data is collected, interpreted, or presented, the following ethical considerations will be factored into the research design.

Ethical Considerations and Trustworthiness

As the research and the researcher are linked to one another, it is of the utmost importance for high ethical decisions to be made when designing, conducting, and analyzing the research. The following considerations were taken into account to ensure a high measure of ethical standards are achieved. Lincoln (1990) supported the primary research tool as “the posture that researchers are in the best position to determine, within certain guidelines, what constitutes ethicality in social science research” (p. 290). To guide my ethical stance and practice, I chose to adopt professional values and standards for ethical practices in conducting research. The Association for the Study of Higher Education’s Principles of Ethical Conduct (2003) are used to guide the ethical approach. In addition, a peer debriefing will help limit bias.

Strategy #1 - Subjectivity and Bias Check

To ensure a high degree of trustworthiness, it is important for the researcher to clarify any existing bias (Creswell, 2003). As such, it is important that I note two biases. Although I am a doctoral student, I also maintain a full-time position as a mid-level administrator in student affairs within a public university that uses an RCM system. During my time working in student affairs, I have seen that a RCM system allows an efficient use of human and financial resources while also changing the priorities of academic deans to a focus on making sound fiscal decisions.

Additionally, I have also witnessed negative aspects of RCM systems including replication of student affairs functions, competition for students, and student affairs prioritization of select academic programs. My experiences could create a subjectivity toward how I interact with other student affairs leaders and how I interpret their decisions. Understanding both the positive and negative subjectivity will be essential for establishing a trustworthy study. Being aware and checking my feelings will assist me in removing my bias during the study. Creswell (2003) suggested a peer debriefing process to increase the accuracy of an interpretation. I plan to conduct peer debriefings with a doctoral program colleague and then my chair during the data collection and analysis of this study. The primary intent of these meetings will be to make connection to the study's conceptual framework.

Strategy #2- Reflective Journal

Also, to assist in monitoring my bias, I will maintain a reflective journal. After each proposed interview day, I will record my thoughts and feelings about the data. Additionally, when I arrive at the data interpretation stage, I will add to these primary reflections with additional commentary on my bias when developing patterns among the data. While the naturalist approach to interviews and case studies may have its detriments, the proximity of the student affairs leaders as a decision maker will produce rich results (Lofland & Lofland, 1995). My hope is that this study benefits from my deep knowledge of student affairs, budget affairs, and working within an RCM environment. I am in a unique position to see, identify, and understand the adaptive or constructive qualities of planned or implemented decisions that will emerge from the case studies.

Strategy #3- Member Checking

During the collection of the data, I plan to conduct a member check. The transcriptions of the interviews will be fact checked by the interviewees. This will enhance the trustworthiness of the data and assist with filtering out interviewer bias. The review process will build a more credible data set in order for the study's findings to be used as generalizable research (Creswell, 1997). Detailed and accurate interviews build the strongest multi-site case study. No biased cases studies will facilitate the interpretation of the data to be both generalized and transferred to other campus settings (Creswell, 1997).

Strategy #4- Peer Review

Also during data collection and presentation of findings, I will discuss my interpretation and organization of the data. This will also enhance the dependability of the data and check interviewer bias. This quality check will also enable the generalization of findings and interpretation (Creswell, 1997).

Strategy #5- External Validity

External validity is defined as the extent to which the findings of the study are generalizable to other campuses and student affairs departments. Because the purpose of this research is to gain an understanding of student affairs decision making within units of departments on two campuses, the specific findings may be generalized for use by other universities. Also, as Yin (1989) suggested, there is a measure of analytic generalizability between theory and evidence. The conceptual framework that informs this study can be applied to similar phenomenon or similar institutional settings at other

universities. I think this may be the most important contribution to the field of student affairs.

Limitations

The data in this study is limited to two institutions. As such, the findings may not be generalizable to other student affairs units, other universities, or other units or functions at the institutions in the study. Notwithstanding, the conceptual framework employed and advanced during this study has a degree of generalizability. The research design and framework may provide others with an opportunity for replication, thus building on this empirical work. A second limitation of this study is the fact that I will serve as the primary research instrument. Despite my commitment to be ethical in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data and to the overall validity of the study, it is important to identify and reconcile my biases. The third limitation of the study is the use of obtrusive measures to construct a narrative through interviews. Although essential for analysis trends and patterns, the accuracy of the interview may be flawed. Responder's confusion of the meaning of questions as well as impartial or subjective responses may damage the integrity of the data. Furthermore, the limited number of interviews were three at each case study site for a total of six which may comprise each case study to not accurately reflect all student affairs leaders' perception of RCM budget and planning environment. Finally, this study is limited by my own understanding of the methodical approach and conceptual framework. Regardless of these limitations, I believe this study will advance knowledge in the study of higher education and student affairs.

Ethical Presentation of Findings

The final step in achieving a principled study is clear, precise, and unbiased presentation of the findings. After gathering the data in the field, my intention is not to persuade, convince, or advocate for particular strategies, but to categorize them per the theoretical framework. The ethical presentation of the data is important to accurately describe without leading the reader to any unnecessary and/or obtrusive viewpoints.

Summary

In conclusion, this chapter provided a description and the rationale of procedures and methods for the study that will be conducted. A qualitative study, employing interviews as the main source of data collection, was used for the discovery of patterns, allowing for an emergent design to the study. Four to six student affairs leaders on two campuses with similar make ups and experience with a RCM system are proposed as subjects for interviews. An interview protocol was created consisting of questions and issues that should be addressed during data collection. The use of case studies will be employed to look for patterns which may have extensive variety despite the limited number of cases. The purpose of the study is to better understand the perceptions of student affairs leaders' use of an Adaptive or Constructive model in how they make decisions.

Chapter IV: Findings

The purpose of this exploratory study was to learn how student affairs leaders make decisions within a RCM budget system. Specifically, the study was designed to better understand senior student affairs officers (SSAOs) perceptions regarding their decision making and navigation of the RCM budget environment. Understanding RCM's adaptive and/or constructive impact on student affairs decision making is important when viewed in the current context of decreasing revenues and internal campus competition for existing resources.

Sample

Large public research institutions were selected in this exploratory study based on their early adoption of an RCM budget model. Large public research institutions, especially state flagship campuses, have been noted in the literature as being able to grow tuition dollars because of their prestige. RCM has been touted as an ideal budget model to ensure the academic goals are being met. However, little is known about how student affairs leaders navigate the RCM budget model.

This chapter presents key findings obtained from conducting inductive interviews with SSAOs from two large public research institutions that use a RCM budget model. A profile of each SSAO interviewee, as well as the institution chosen for the study, will highlight the similarities in the case study design. The findings are presented with supporting data from two case study institutions. Quotes from each institution studied tell the story of the overall impact of RCM budget model on student affairs decision making. Then, in Chapter 5 the findings are applied to Chaffee framework (1983 & 1985) to analyze the extent to which each student affairs divisions are either Adaptive,

Constructive, and/or both Adaptive and Constructive decision making. In other words, does RCM change or distort SSAOs decision making in carrying out mission of student affairs in order to access more resources or stay true to existing values and goals.

A question guide was used to help structure the interviews and yet still allow for an emergent process to capture added information not included in the prescribed questions (See Appendix A for a list of the questions). The inductive process allowed the interviewees to feel comfortable sharing added perceptions of how they, as SSAOs, make decisions in the RCM budget environment. Ultimately, these questions may help determine the effect of RCM on SSAO decision making and if there is a similarity in Constructivist and/or Adaptive approaches to student affairs decision making using Chaffee's study as a conceptual framework. The framework may help describe if there are overall strategies to how student affairs is making decisions. The framework may also provide a lens to better understand how the RCM budget model effects student affairs decision making which will inform scholars and practitioners.

The case study campuses were selected because of their similar institutional make-up as large state research institutions with comparable student affairs composition as well as the length of time that RCM budget model was established. The findings were categorized as major if they directly connected to the exploratory study questions regarding the perceptions of how the budget model impacted decision making for SSAOs. Four major findings are discussed in this chapter which include:

1. SSAOs strongly agreed that organizational decision making strategies are affected by the RCM budget model. SSAOs assume student affairs services are replicated within academic schools due in part because RCM increases

school's autonomy to make localized decisions and use internal resources to grow replicated and competitive student affairs functions.

2. The RCM model had a direct effect on how student affairs services and programs are structured and delivered due to academic school's replication of select student affairs areas. A dramatically similar response from all SSAOs interviewed stated there was a level of competition with academic schools for programs and services. A common theme was RCM's impact on student affairs structure and delivery by embedding services within academic schools and the growth of student affairs training programs for academic schools who have replicated student affairs staff and functions.
3. The third major finding was how and in what way RCM influences SSAOs' positioning and prioritization of decision making in the acquisition of campus resources. SSAOs discussed how they positioned offices to gain more resources in an RCM environment such as distorting their mission, selling services, and teaching courses for financial gain.
4. Finally, SSAOs shared their common perceptions regarding the central administration's and academic schools' valuing of student affairs work. SSAOs perceive some of their central administration and academic school leadership within a RCM model but others hold less value for similar services. SSAOs also explained that external mandates affect how student affairs is valued by the central administration and skews the importance of these functions and services.

The following is a discussion of the major findings with supporting quotes which highlight each finding. With the analysis of the two case studies, there is a better understanding of the effect of RCM on SSAOs decision making.

Profile of Institutions and Interviewees

Two major institutions were selected based on three criteria: institutional type, student affairs department make-up, and the extent of time the RCM system was implemented. First, the comparable institutions were both selected from the Big Ten Athletic Conference as well as their Carnegie classification as Doctoral University with the Highest Research Additivity that support arts and sciences plus professional academic schools (McCormick & Zhao, 2005). Second, each student affairs department had similar scope of responsibilities, organization, and reporting units. As an example, both case studies had a similar portfolio of functions and services including: counseling, student conduct, student union, parent program, health center, career center, health promotion, as well as leadership, inclusion, and involvement programs. Third, both institutions implemented RCM for more than a decade. This is an essential characteristic to ensure the RCM is firmly ensconced in budget and planning model processes, protocols and culture of the institution. The institutional type, commonality of student affairs functions and services, and the length of time RCM has been implemented at both institutions increase the opportunity to interpret and compare the value of decisions made by SSAOs (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

Interviews were conducted with select SSAOs from each institution in the multi-site case study. The SSAOs were selected by the Vice Presidents of Student Affairs at each case study site for their longevity, knowledge, and decision making roles within the

division of student affairs. The following is a brief profile of each of the six SSAOs, grouped by case study sites who were chosen and volunteered to participate in the exploratory study:

1. MWU #1 – oversaw residential life and student union functions. They had been employed at the institution for more than two decades. The incumbent left the institution and returned ten years ago to serve in a SSAO role.
2. MWU #2 – supervised budget affairs, assessment, and oversaw a number of task groups and committees that involved many constituencies across the division as well as academic schools. The incumbent work in a variety of roles and had over a 30-year career at the institution.
3. MWU #3- oversaw crisis management, student conduct, leadership, community engagement, diversity, and other student development oriented functions including student organizations, student activities, and fraternity and sorority life. The incumbent had been at the previous intuition with RCM. They had been at MWU for more than 10 years.
4. NWU #1 – is the vice president for student affairs. The SSAO worked at other large research institutions and for five years at NWU.
5. NWU #2 – oversaw student union, career advising, parent programs, engagement programs, leadership, community engagement, student organizations, student activities, and fraternity and sorority life. The incumbent served at the institution for over two decades in numerous roles and was recently promoted to the senior leadership team.
6. NWU #3 – serves as the chief of staff responsible for numerous task groups, campus wide committees, and projects. The incumbent had worked for the institution for over 20 years in a variety of student affairs roles.

Combined, the six senior student affairs officers were selected at each case study site for their depth of knowledge of student affairs. All six were part of the top leadership team, directed numerous units, and held budget and decision-making responsibilities as part of their executive roles. The similarities of the three SSAOs at each case study site builds confidence in the knowledge of the RCM budget model and trustworthiness of the data.

Major Findings

The four major findings were derived from three individual interviews at each case study site as well as comparing both case studies to each other. The individual case study findings are a broad mix of all interviews from each institution. Consistent patterns from both institutions create the major findings and are summarized at the conclusion of the reported findings. It is important to note the major findings and the emergent findings were consistent within each case study site across the two institutions. This strongly suggests that RCM has a consistent impact on student affairs decision making.

Major Finding One: RCM Affects Student Affairs Decision Making

The study found that SSAOs consistently reported that RCM budget model affects their decision making. SSAOs had complex and mostly negative feelings about their relationship with and perceptions of the RCM budget model. Reflecting how student affairs decision making was impacted by RCM, SSAOs think it challenges, impairs, and causes them to make different decisions. SSAOs used words such as frustration, decentralization, replication, competing, fear, customization, and cooperation to describe the impact of the RCM budgeting system on decision making. SSAOs assume student affairs services are replicated within academic schools due in part to academic schools' fiscal autonomy to add select student affairs functions.

How RCM impacts decision making and is valued are discussed more in-depth in the following research questions. The study will share what SSAOs stated at the first case study site, MWU, followed by SSAOs' perspectives at NWU, the second case study. Then a review each case study will present the finding.

SSAOs at MWU discussed the freedom an academic institution had to replicate central student affairs functions as well as change how student affairs traditionally operate in a centralized model as a result of RCM. SSAOs shared how RCM exacerbates academic schools' freedom allowing the replication of student affairs and student affairs having to change and customize itself to academic schools. The SSAOs believed that the replication was due in part to the RCM practice and policies which allow academic schools freedom to duplicate student affairs services.

Below are SSAO comments regarding a few examples of how RCM affects student affairs decision making. Examples of how student affairs changes will be discussed more in-depth in questions two and three. The comments are from the three MWU SSAOs when asked how RCM affected student affairs decision making when services are replicated by academic schools. The tone of the quotes suggest that the SSAOs were mostly frustrated that their functions and services were being replicated. The first quote discusses how academic schools' autonomy and freedom as a result of RCM allows them to replicate select student affairs services.

We're [student affairs] doing that work, leadership and other things, and in some cases competing with ourselves [academic schools] as a university. If you've got the money, got the donors, got the activity [revenue generation], got the enrollment, you [academic schools] get a lot of freedom. (MWU #1)

A colleague at MWU and the Associate Vice President of Student Affairs (AVP) in charge of both business operations as well as committee work across student affairs units regarding learning outcomes and assessment, further described how the RCM model has resulted in a negotiation of what is central and what is academic student affairs saying:

We recognize that it's like it's the "and-both" approach. It's not saying, "No, no. We're the central career office, everybody has to come here," or, "We want this

embedded approach and everything has to report to us," but rather saying, "School, college," again that seek first to understand what are your unique needs and what are the needs that are more general? And how can you put your resources to the specific things that we could never be specialists in? And how can we relieve you of the more dare I say "generic needs" of our students so that we have the optimal use of the central resources and the school, college-based resources." (MWU #3).

I offer that as we're just coming to those conversations now... of what's central and what's replicated because there's a kind of walking the bridge together that we need to do with the schools and colleges, recognizing that each school has its own culture. It's not as if we can enter into a, I don't know, let's say standardized MOU [Memorandum of Understanding] that just applies to every school and college. It's going to have to be crafted individually and we have 19 schools and colleges. I do think that longer term, that kind of ... negotiation and relationship building and direct connection is going to probably align the resources in a much more viable way than either trying to assert, no, no, we're this not that, or trying to be all things to all people. (MWU #3).

The MWU SSAOs felt RCM impact student affairs decision making resulting in replication of select student affairs services thus forcing student affairs to customize their services for each academic school. If student affairs have to concern themselves with how to customize services for each academic school, it may drastically change how SSAOs make decisions. RCM is touted as creating more efficiencies, however in student affairs SSAOs perspective is that it breeds a lack of efficiency due to duplication of services unless student affairs changes. How student affairs is structured and delivered will be further explained in the second research question.

A third MWU SSAO responsible for student development added that some student affairs units find it much more challenging to form relationships to academic schools within RCM. They reflected how some academic areas that have grown student affairs as a result of RCM are more territorial and less willing to form collaborative relationships thus exacerbating the effect on student affairs decision making. The MWU SSAO stated:

A [SSAO unit leader] colleague has tried to advance [their unit's student affairs] and it not getting traction in the academic units, because I think some of that they view that as competing with the work that they're doing, versus my staff are more a resource enhancement [which are utilized] often in very difficult times, we walk alongside them [as supporting their student affairs staff]. (MWU #2)

As a collective, the MWU SSAOs agree that RCM affects their decision making regarding how they customize support for parallel academic school and how they position themselves with each school in different ways. SSAOs reflected that this was not an efficient way to organize student affairs services and functions. NWU SSAOs had similar perspectives to share.

The Associate Vice President at NWU, when asked if student affairs was more or less decentralized, responded, "Wow. I think more [decentralized]." When asked in their opinion, what was the impact of RCM budgeting model on student affairs and does it attributes to decentralization of student affair services within academic schools. The NMU AVP said emphatically, "Oh, I think it definitely attributes to it [the decentralization of student affairs]." When asked in what way, they shared:

It's just the sense of competition and the sense of limited resource and the sense of who pays-in and who receives [resources], it [RCM] just creates a very us [student affairs] versus them [academic schools] mentality. (NMU #3)
Yeah. I would definitely say it's [student affairs replication] happening. That's a really good question because we do have a whole office for equity and diversity and then in most of the colleges they have created positions and then with our division we have a multicultural student engagement area and of course we work with a lot of the multicultural student groups. That has actually been a conversation that's been out there that there seems to be a lot of replication and I couldn't even tell you all the different sources of funding. I imagine every source of funding is going to that area because we have so much replication in that area, for sure. (NMU #2)

When asked if RCM impacted student affairs, the SSAO shared about academic schools' duplication of select student affairs services, however they were less sure that RCM impacted decentralization of services stating:

I think here it's been pretty neutral only because we are so large that I think probably any budget model that we used would likely have no effect on that. This has always been a decentralized university. I think if the needle has shifted, and I do think it has, but it's not a seismic shift. (NMU #3)

When asked if the RCM had any impact on the defining student affairs services as a central utility and/or allowing or exacerbating the decentralization and duplication of student within schools, the SSAO pondered and continued, saying:

Yeah. I think decentralization versus centralization, there's always friction there. We experience it, too. Even with the acknowledgement that I think most people believe and we are structurally set up to be very decentralized... I think it [RCM] definitely attributes to it [decentralization]. Like I said just the sense of competition and the sense of limited resource and the sense of who pays in and who receives, it just creates a very us versus them mentality. (NMU #3)
I think they feel like a lot of what we provide is duplicated through various student services that are provided at the collegiate level. (NMU #3)

When offered the opportunity to reflect more deeply on the impact of RCM these SSAO colleagues also came to a similar conclusion. Adding to this perspective, the NWU general SSAO reiterated a similar sentiment regarding RCM's influence on how student affairs is impacted by highlighting partnership when crisis occurs and in training programs stating:

I think there's duplication within all the academic units, there's also student affairs units [within the academic schools]. We have the central office of student affairs but then in the academic units, they also have their own student affairs, student services personnel. That will handle, you know, issues of crisis and so we do partner with them, we do have liaisons which is good. Which has allowed us to really sit down and do more trainings together. Do planning together on programs and services but sometimes there is a duplication of services... We are trying to really reduce any type of redundancy that we do have across campus. (NWU #1)

The fact that academic schools can afford to hire their own student affairs staff and that the central student affairs offices focuses on training programs for academic student affairs and planning sessions to reduce redundancy strongly suggests that RCM has an impact on SSAOs' decision making. Additionally, it appears that SSAOs design student

affairs differently depending on which academic school it is assisting. NWU SSAOs reflected that this is not an efficient way to deliver student affairs. When asked, a NWU coordinating SSAO, shared their perspective on administrative feelings about the effect of duplication of student affairs within academic departments. The SSAOs commented:

Again I think that would be another example of where the colleges might think that things that we provide just duplicate what they're already providing and so therefore there's some, I wouldn't say like anger is too strong of a word, but maybe annoyance at having to pay into the cost pool [RCM tax to the central administration] to support something like [the central student affairs service] that service. (NMU #2)

One of the challenges that we face is that we compete with other units for the same dollars. We might be making a strong case, but again we're up against all the other units that are in the same system as are to try to advocate for those dollars. It does become almost competitive with other units at the university. (NWU #3)

The MWU SSAOs share another example of an academic school's making plans for a duplication of services but with no connection to the central student affair career services as a direct result of RCM budget model. The MWU auxiliary AVP bemoaned that the academic school was determined to circumvent student affairs to create an academic school based student affairs career services center. They remarked:

For this dean to propose a career center and it make its' way all the way up in conversation and estimating without consultation with student affairs is quite surprising. There's a lot of tension around that. This dean has the money, from enrollment and credit hours. This dean has donors because we organize our donor activities, of course, around credit hours, the schools and colleges deans. Money ends up being the driver versus the principle philosophy cooperation coordination in this kind of environment. (MWU #1):

The SSAOs' perspective that academic schools have negative feelings for paying into a cost pool (NWU term for the RCM tax) for central student affairs suggests a level of competition between student affairs and academic schools which is a similar response to the second case study institution. The NMU and MWU SSAOs shared feelings that

RCM exacerbated a decentralization and duplication of resources. However, this replication of student affairs was not the same in each academic school. SSAOs commented that replication varied per academic school.

As a collective, all of the SSAOs interviewed at both case study sites discussed the impact of RCM budget model. NMU and MWU SSAOs both clearly described how student affairs is affected by the RCM budget model. Student affairs decision making at both case studies described a level of concern over the RCM budgeting model's exacerbation of duplication, competition, as well as changed the student affairs service orientation depending on each academic school's absence or growth of student affairs. The NWU SSAOs were more negative sighting competition that existed between student affairs and academic schools. The MWU SSAOs seem to have developed better relationships with academic school student affairs and "walked alongside them" in more connected relationships.

Each of these adaptations of student affairs will be further explored in the second and third research questions regarding how RCM affects student affairs structure and delivery as well as how student affairs goes about positioning and prioritizing decision making for more resources. Further, SSAOs had recommendations and advice on how to navigate decision making in this type of environment which will be explored in Chapter Five. As this exploratory study responds to the first research questions there is strong evidence that SSAOs' perception of RCM system is that it does affect student affairs decision making.

Building on this affirmative evidence that the RCM model has a direct effect on student affairs, I will explore how student affairs services and programs are structured

and delivered. A dramatically similar response from all SSAOs interviewed stated they were in competition and/or coordination with academic schools for programs and services. A common theme was how RCM impacted how SSAOs made decisions to structure and deliver central services to meet academic schools' needs. Each of these examples will be explored in more depth regarding the second major finding regarding SSAOs' perception that RCM changes how student affairs is structured and delivered.

Major Finding Two: SSAO Perception of How Student Affairs is Structured and Delivered

As found in the first research question across both case studies, SSAOs thought that RCM exacerbated the replication and created a threat of competition of student affairs services and programs with those in academic schools. When asked if RCM had an effect on how student affairs was structured and delivered, SSAOs gave clear examples including: customizing approaches to delivering student affairs for each academic school's student affairs needs, embedding or locating central student affairs services within academic schools, and the growth of liaison and training programs for academic schools-replicated student affairs staff. SSAOs perceived academic schools level of autonomy due to RCM as a reason for the replication of their functions.

SSAOs believe that academic schools can grow student affairs functions because they have the budget, control of the budget, and autonomy within the RCM model to meet their particular school needs. However, it was the perception of SSAOs that academic schools select specific student affairs service functions based on their school's needs. As a result, SSAOs discussed customizing their services and approaches to each

academic school. A couple of examples SSAOs shared was creating liaison roles, training programs, and physically embedding services in and for academic schools. SSAOs' examples demonstrated that the RCM model does impact how student affairs is structured and delivered.

At MWU, the embedded model is firmly in place. The embedded model of the structure and delivery of student affairs is physically locating student affairs services within academic schools but maintaining reporting lines through student affairs. As an example, the student affairs counseling offices at MWU created an embedded model to prevent select academic schools from creating their own student affairs services models. The MWU AVP for Auxiliary Services reflected that SSAOs were choosing an embedded model as a different and defensive strategy for central student affairs services to be structured and delivered to respond to academic schools stating:

With mental health issues and student wellbeing concerns, the schools and colleges were clamoring for, and we kept adding increased staffing for counselors in the counseling center. That still wasn't good enough. We could continue to add and people would still have a wait for services. What the schools and colleges completely got behind is wanting to have an embedded model, and we fought this at first, and then we ceded ourselves over to it and it's been enormously successful. We didn't want the engineering school to create their own counseling center, and that was the fear, the slippery slope of an embedded model. (MWU #1)

The MWU's Dean of Students added that they were supported by central administration in expanding the embedded model because schools wanted to grow their own counseling services:

Instead of them creating their own counseling center, they provide the space, the provost actually gave us more counselors than were asked for because of pressure by the schools and colleges to expand [counseling]. (MWU #2)

MWU shared that these training programs were part of a change to student affairs as content experts. SSAOs at MWU shared:

They value student affairs, these units, academic units and leadership, value student affairs. For example, on issues right now, diversity, equity, and inclusion we're getting lots of calls. Can we come and speak to them or do presenting and training? (MWU #1)

The second major finding was also consistent across both campuses. SSAOs observed that student affairs is structured and delivered differently as a result of RCM.

Specifically, SSAOs make decisions to alter how student affairs services are delivered to select schools by either providing a liaison with academic schools and/or physically emending student affairs services. Additionally, SSAOs at both institutions discussed how they are offering select training programs in academic areas. Training programs may or may not be an example of how student affairs is augmented in an RCM model. Further exploratory research could be conducted to discover if these training programs are indeed an example of how student affairs is changed as a result of RCM.

At NMU, SSAOs acknowledged the need for liaison staff to assist with training of academic school student affairs. NMU felt the need to create more liaison positions to build relationships with academic school student affairs personnel. NMU student affairs advance relationships with academic schools as a systems approach to delivering student affairs services through staff relationships. The SSAO commented:

If we see a need, so for example, we need to develop a position about academic integrity in helping faculty encouraging them report more academic dishonesty cases because sometimes they tend not to, do we need to create a faculty liaison place position that would help encourage our faculty to do so, to train them differently? Would we need to create more case manager positions to deal with student mental health in the academic units? So I think that helps when you build up those relationships from the beginning so that we can talk about you know, how can we have a system type approach to the work that we're doing. (NWU #1)

NMU had direct liaison positions for each school. The SSAOs shared that NMU student affairs supports and trains academic school student affairs areas on an as-needed basis.

The SSAO at NWU stated:

No, I think there's duplication so within all the academic units, there's also student affairs units. We have the central office of student affairs but then in the academic units, they also have their own student affairs, student services personnel. That will handle, you know, issues of crisis and so we do partner with them, we do have liaisons which is good. Which has allowed us to really sit down and do more trainings together. Do planning together on programs and services but sometimes there is a duplication services (NWU #1).

NWU stopped short of an embedded staffing model. At NMU, SSAOs were considering the same embedded model. NMU student affairs has plans to change its structure and delivery of programs. One SSAO stated:

We're actually just looking at doing some piloting of the embedded counselor program right now (NWU #3)

NMU and MWU SSAOs shared similar responses regarding how student affairs functions have changed to meet the needs of academic schools. However, it seems that SSAOs at NMU may be just starting to advance the relationships with academic schools' student affairs versus MWU's more established relationships. SSAOs at both institutions perceived how student affairs is structured and provided differently as a shift in thinking as well. SSAOs on both campuses discussed being able to be experts and/or offer higher level support to academic school student affairs personnel. SSAOs thought that academics schools that have grown student affairs have a greater appreciation for central student affairs functions and services. This will be explored in findings from the fourth and final research question. The third research questions describe how SSAOs better position student affairs to increase resources for their areas.

Major Finding Three: SSAO Perception of How to Best Position Departments for More Resources

The third major finding was SSAOs' perspectives on how and in what way RCM influences the positioning and prioritization of decisions to acquire more campus resources. Two themes emerged. First, SSAOs at both case study sites had examples of how they needed to position themselves to acquire more resources by how they choose to gain support from decision makers. SSAOs shared the difficulty in the central administration's support of student affairs. Second, a common approach to position student affairs for more resources was becoming more business-like through decision making that led to entrepreneurial approaches to student affairs.

Case study sites differed in their approach to how SSAOs connected the mission and purpose of student affairs with either academic school's missions and/or the intuitional mission. These differences will be noted and further processed in Chapter Five in the analysis of Constructive versus Adaptive decision making.

At MWU the SSAO for business affairs discussed the need to connect student affairs and institutional mission in order to gain support from top decision makers. MWU student affairs seeks to clarify its shared values by taking cues from both the central administration as well as the trustees in order for student affairs to prioritize and position itself. However, this SSAO also noted that these can be in conflict and further noted that RCM may impair some form of student affairs work. They stated:

When you are talking about institutionally what are your values. That can sometimes be much more intangible and yet much more important to guiding decision making than what's your activity because the activity in some ways is the tool of choice at any given point of how we choose to lean into our values. The challenge of course at a highly decentralized institution such as ours is negotiating at the highest possible level [central administration and trustees] what those

shared values are ... and that there are, one, a lot of competing values. Sometimes they are and-both and sometimes they are, you know, at the end of the day when hard choices need to be made, prioritized in a way that might seem to be in conflict with another. (MWU #3)

Part of what I would say is that part of the adapting is recognizing that this tiered approach that we've taken ... and you can spell that both ways. It helps us understand our work from, if you will, an RCM perspective but it also has ... influenced our capacity to deliver on broader sets of work that aren't necessarily assigned within a particular silo, if you will, and that more sensibly through a provost office [central administration] perspective there's an expectation where, "Well, you have resources. You should be able to deliver on this new set of work," let's say, but from our perspective we're saying, No, no. You don't understand. Those dollars are dedicated to our inter-group relations [as an example] work and we have to really channel, utilize those resources for that set of work. (MWU #3).

SSAOs shared a perception that RCM budget model compromises student affairs work which cuts across organizational boundaries. SSAOs report they have more difficulty positioning and gaining resources for their mission from central administration as a result of RCM. A MWU SSAO commented:

The way student affairs delivered on its mission was through the defined units that have a set of work expectations that they delivered on ... which is well and good until of course you have this, as we've talking about, the horizontal work that then requires a kind of resources that haven't necessarily been defined for cross organizational work. (MWU #2)

MWU SSAOs colleagues further expanded on the notion that RCM disadvantages some student affairs areas. SSAOs shared that external forces and pressure may entice some disadvantaged student affairs areas to position themselves differently in order to try to gain more resources. The SSAO was concerned that this form of decision making could fundamentally change student affairs unit missions toward risk management, student safety, and compliance. MWU SSAOs shared a perspective that RCM may skew student affairs decision making from their missions in order to gain more resources. MWU SSAOs commented:

I think another way that it [RCM] affects decision making is, it might cause units to distort their mission or their request for funding based on, for example, right now we know, as I mentioned earlier that risk management compliance and things are those things that get funded. Units might distort their work or distort their rationale for budget requests based on what the likelihood of being funded. I think is one of the things they can do. It might, I think in some cases, have caused people to seek data, because in an RCM kind of environment, very data driven, it causes people to seek data that rationalizes a request for funding. (MWU #1)

This finding will be further explored in Chapter Five. The second example SSAOs at both campuses discussed was the need for positioning student affairs to develop entrepreneurial approaches to achieve student affairs priorities.

The MWU auxiliary AVP discussed how they have reworked student affairs functional areas to cut costs and sell services in order to assist other general fund-supported student affairs units. The SSAO stated that they needed “to drive revenues up because we can't count on allocations to employ university sources like we once could.” The SSAO stated that student affairs is also considering selling diversity services and already sells leadership programs and teaches a leadership course for income with select academic schools. The student affairs motivation to sell services is an effort to increase revenue, reduce replication, and maintain more autonomy of select student affairs functions. The MWU AVP for auxiliary's remarked:

We have some units, like most student affairs divisions that do a lot of diversity work. Well, I have a person in one of my units, housing, who's the director of diversity for that unit and she's increasingly been asked to go present and train in academic units. On the one hand, that sounds like a wonderful partnership. However, in a highly measured RCM activity-based environment, in an environment where only risk and compliance gets funded, one of the questions we're forced to ask ourselves is, well, does she have the time to ... she has a full-time job in housing so does she have the time to go do that work somewhere else? Is she being compensated? If so, she needs to take a day off or is this a revenue opportunity for the department given that school and college has money because enrollment is high? They haven't hired a training person. I say that just to say that's one example of how you begin to look at work that is otherwise just good partnership and good student affairs work. (MWU #1)

Another MWU SSAO added that the decision to sell services is counter to the prevailing culture of student affairs. This SSAO felt that more professional development is needed to assist student affairs staff in quantifying the value of their work in an RCM model.

They concluded:

Yeah, I think we can navigate [RCM]. I don't prefer it [RCM] necessarily for these general fund kinds of units but I think we can navigate it. So far we've been reasonably successful. I think in student affairs though, we're not very entrepreneurial and we're reluctant to play the administrative and political game that's required to operate successfully in that [RCM] environment. Because we're so passionately committed to the work, let's say diversity work for example again, we actually don't like the idea, I think as student affairs professionals, of commodifying [services]. I understand that but to navigate it well, and I think we can [commodify services], we actually have to believe that that work has value, social value and financial value in an RCM environment and begin to quantify it so that we can do more work. (MWU #1)

In the case of student leadership programs, yeah, these places [academic schools] have money. The school of business doesn't pay [student affairs] for anything. They have a [student affairs] leadership center. We want to coordinate [with the School of Business]. The engineering program gives us [student affairs] money [for student affairs leadership programs] and so there's some coordination there. (MWU #1)

In addition to selling co-curricular student affairs services, SSAOs at MWU are also thinking about developing an entrepreneurial approach to selling services to select academic schools for teaching of academic courses. The SSAO commented:

We have units that actually generate credit hours in schools and colleges. They co-teach or teach, we teach an RA class which is a psychology department class, students are two credits for, and RAs are two credits. All of that revenue from those credit hour production goes to the school of literature, science and the arts... All of that tuition credit hour generated, credit hour revenue generated goes to the school in which that's taught... I have been asking a lot of questions lately about why are we generating revenue on our labor basically, for those school and colleges. In RCM they can keep it. (MWU #1)

Although MWU SSAOs' decision to sell teaching services is a clear example of an entrepreneurial approach to gaining more resources, it was still pausing on commodifying

other non-academic services. Both conversations, however, were clear examples of how SSAOs at MWU are positioning student affairs to acquire more resources.

At the second case study site, NWU had similar examples of how student affairs positioned themselves to acquire more resources with how they approached decision makers and how they were becoming more entrepreneurial in selling select services to academic schools for more revenue. NWU SSAOs shared complex responses in how RCM poses distinct challenges in positioning and prioritizing student affairs decision making based on need to balance institutional mission with academic schools' priorities. SSAOs perceive challenges in balancing the institutional mission, central administration priorities, and, in some instances, academic schools' individual needs within an RCM environment. SSAOs shared even when there are clear administrative priorities in support of the institutional mission that RCM may skew their ability to advocate for more resources.

At NWU, SSAOs also felt they were at odds with the central administration and academic schools for positioning student affairs for more resources. NWU SSAOs focus on establishing strong data driven proposals tied to the institutional mission. However, even though SSAOs focused on tying data to a larger institutional mission, they felt the need to bypass central administration for support and work with academic school leadership and external trustees. The NWU VP of the student union stated, "We just have to keep collecting that data to illustrate our value and then trying to get it up the chain." The NWU VP responsible for the campus union explained further that data must be linked to the educational mission, a constructivist frame, but that collecting data is not

enough if student affairs is not part of budget conversations with central administration and academic school leadership. The SSAO stated:

I would say, make sure that you are assessing, that you are evaluating, that you are keeping track of the data, telling your story by using that data, have clearly articulated objectives and outcomes and really tie it to the mission, tying it to the student learning and the student development outcomes and really pay attention to your board of regents or your board of trustees to see which direction they want to take the university so that you can make any type of tweaks or adjustments along the way. (NWU #1)

For me, when it comes to the decision making again it's, how is this aligning with our mission, our values, our priorities. Is it effective in what we want to accomplish? Working with the academic units, is this something that is a need within, which they're seeing with their students specifically. (NWU #1)

Another NWU SSAO stated a similar position. The SSAO shared they needed to prioritize decision making in the acquisition of campus resources using a political framework to circumvent the central administration in order to influence academic school leadership to support student affairs stating:

Education is so important and what the role student affairs has is critical and we need to just be figuring out how we can increase our resources every possible way. Especially in partnerships with colleges, it's critical and we got to get us at table with the [academic school] deans. I do think that the data collection and really especially related to ... People are saying we're graduating these students but they don't have the skills to do the job and we know that we can provide that skillset to the students outside the classroom so we need to start talking about that and we need to work with employers and other people and really get the message, in my opinion, to the highest level, which would be the board of regents and board of trustees, to really understand they have to reshape how we use our resources on our campuses, if that makes sense. That's why I've got myself going to our board or regents [trustees] in May to talk about the co-curricular transcript. If I get to them first and up there and get them excited, then it's going to have to trickle to the colleges [academic schools]. (NWU #2)

It appears that NWU SSAOs have little trust in the central administration or even academic school leadership but are working outside of these relationships to gain external support for student affairs.

Similarly, to MWU, the NWU SSAOs explained that student affairs is becoming more businesslike by selling teaching services to academic schools. In addition to the support it receives from the central administration, student affairs is positioning itself to academic schools by selling its student affairs career services as well as teaching services. The NWU budget planning SSAO explained that academic schools value select student affairs services enough to want to purchase them. They stated:

We have three colleges that have basically outsourced their career and internship services to student affairs and they are actually funding student affairs to run their career and internships services so that's kind of an odd one our campus. Those three colleges career and internship services areas report into student affairs but then the revenue comes from the colleges because they don't want to manage the details so that's been a real interesting. (NWU #2).

At NWU, student affairs has already developed this entrepreneurial approach by receiving compensation for career services as well as selling teaching services to academic schools. The NWU SSAOs shared:

The leadership engagement and the disciplines, development for undergraduates. We have a leadership minor program, which is shared with our college of education and human development as well as our school of public affairs. They are the co-sponsors but percentages of tuition remains with our leadership program. (NWU #1)

Our leadership minor we're teaching, oh my gosh, I don't know how many classes we have right now. We have a really strong curriculum for that but we haven't really delved more in the co-curricular side and I think with that, like I said, the colleges are outsourcing to consultants to bring in those leadership components and experiences and I think that's ridiculous that we're going outside our institution when we have ... That's why we have to get out there and sell and convince the colleges we have that in-house and we need you to help support it. (NWU #2)

We have three colleges that have basically outsourced their career and internship services to student affairs and they are actually funding student affairs to run their career and internships services so that's kind of an odd one our campus. Those three college career and internship services areas report into student affairs but then the revenue comes from the colleges because they don't want to manage the details so that's been a real interesting. (NWU #2)

SSAOs at NWU were also considering billing academic schools for co-curricular tracking services as another entrepreneurial source of income. The SSAO responsible for co-curricular leadership programs shared:

We're just on the front side of rolling out a student engagement record which is a co-curricular transcript and I think that's a piece that can help us get into some of these academic areas because we're hoping all the colleges will be using this new tool. Some are already starting to work with us on that so I do see, I have this vision that we hopefully will get some more support in that area down the line.
(NWU #2)

It appears entrepreneurial behavior is a driver for positioning student affairs. At both case study sites SSAOs discussed the need to become more creative in finding ways to increase resources. They explained how they are currently selling courses and services and have future plans to become even more entrepreneurial. Student affairs SSAOs added that the services that are being sold were institutional priorities. The NWU and MWU SSAOs explained that especially diversity and leadership programs were institutional priorities and they were also avenues for student affairs to generate its own income in the RCM environment. SSAOs reflected that selling services to academic schools was a way to show how much they valued student affairs. Moreover, the commodification of select student affairs services highlights the lack of support from the central administration for these services. The fourth and final research questions delves deeper into SSAOs' perceptions of how the central and academic schools value student affairs.

The MWU and NWU SSAOs had different perspectives in how they viewed their ability to carry out the institutional mission in a RCM environment. However, both case studies suggest that the central administration is not as helpful in accessing more

resources for student affairs. Both cases studies also suggest that SSAOs pay attention to the institution mission, however, they also pay close attention to individual academic schools' needs as well in order to sell services back to academic schools. In Chapter Five the SSAOs' decision making will be categorized as either adapting to the external environment and/or maintaining their prioritization of the institutional mission.

Major Finding Four: SSAOs Perceptions Regarding the Central and/or Academic Schools' Valuing of Student Affairs Work

The perception reported by SSAOs of how their work is valued by central administration and academic school leadership varies. SSAOs perceive that some of their services and programs hold great importance by central administration and academic school leadership within a RCM model but others are at a distinct disadvantage. Overall, there is consensus that academic schools and central administration feel differently about student affairs functional areas and that there is no one way to view the relationship. SSAOs did reflect that academic schools that have developed student affairs do appreciate their shared work. However, SSAOs clearly discussed that in a RCM model replicated academic school student affairs had an impact on how student affairs was valued. SSAOs clearly worry about competitive relationships due to replicated student affairs functions.

The MWU SSAOs discussed how some student affairs services are valued differently by academic schools and central administration. The MWU SSAOs for student development and auxiliaries' both remarked:

I think academic school leadership values student affairs in a very narrow kind of way. For example, we have moved to an embedded counselor model. As we've

been funded for additional counselors, we have been placing those counselors in academic schools and colleges even though they report to the director of counseling. That has been highly valued. (MWU #2)

They value student affairs, these units, academic units and leadership, value student affairs. For example, on issues right now, diversity, equity, and inclusion we're getting lots of calls. Can we come and speak to them or do presenting and training? I don't think the value is a philosophical one the way units in student affairs value them, that it matters for learning and engagement and civic contribution, rather it's certain things they need. But I'll take it because it's one form of value and it's better than no value. (MWU #1)

The auxiliary SSAO continued when asked if the central administration or academic schools valued student affairs, SSAOs explained:

Yes. Probably less than the academic units, to be very frank with you. I think our central administration values student affairs particularly when there are no protests or when there is a protest, making it go away. It's sort of reputational risk avoidance. (MWU #1)

Other academic schools may find great value in student affairs programs but do not value student affairs to be involved in the coordination or delivery of those student affairs services. The MWU SSAO continued:

I supervised recreational sports. That, actually by the way, is not an auxiliary. They have to generate a million and a half dollars a year to help pay their expenses but they are a general fund unit getting allocations. That case, there is a recreation center, the School of Business constructed a recreation center inside their school and hired a contract company to run it. That's just wasteful. The only students that can participate in it have to pay a fee, are school of business and school of law students. Yes, I see redundancy there. (MWU #1)

Another MWU SSAO added that for academic schools who have grown student affairs there is an expressed positive appreciation of the work of student affairs.

From where I sit in my units, whether that's dean of student's office, services for students with disabilities, not so much Greek life, but in those service areas, I think we enjoy very positive relationships and respect. If they were, thought that they were directly being taxed to pay for our services, I think they would be open to that because they've directly taxed themselves to create parallel services inside their schools and colleges. Then don't say, "No thanks, we've got this. We don't need the central expertise." (MWU #2)

The MWU SSAO continued that academic schools who hold student affairs positions form reciprocal relationships with central student affairs.

Oh, yes I would say that our partnerships are definitely valued and I would say that it's a reciprocal partnership and viewpoint between both of them. For me, when it comes to the decision making again it's, how is this aligning with our mission, our values, our priorities. Is it effective in what we want to accomplish? Working with the academic unit, is this something that is a need within, which they're seeing with their students specifically.

The MWU SSAO continued that academic schools really come to rely on central student affairs for a high level of expertise in dealing with crisis situations, stating:

I think of it more as, they have students of concern or critical incidents, or death of a student, they don't know how to manage the situation. They very readily turn to our central services in the dean of student's office and really respect the work that we do, and have created parallel staffing structures inside most of the schools and colleges, where they have their own student affairs people. When I first got here and saw that I thought, "Oh this is kind of a nightmare, or could be." Those folks realized that, "Hey, I do student affairs work just in the college of engineering, and I know a lot about the complexities of what engineering students face. When a student in engineering dies from a heroin overdose, they don't know how to manage that and they very readily turn to us for support and then appreciate the collegial work that we engage with, with them. (MWU #2)

MWU SSAOs reflected that they are valued by their "parallel" colleagues and have customized how they work with each academic school. An overall common theme was academic schools value their expertise and also their ability to deal with crisis situations. This knowledge may be important insight as RCM becomes a more popular budget system on more college campuses.

SSAOs expanded on this question through the inductive process and shared complex responses in how RCM poses distinct challenges in positioning and prioritizing student affairs decision making based on need to balance institutional mission with academic schools' priorities. SSAOs perceive challenges in balancing the institutional

mission, central administration priorities, and in some instances academic schools' individual needs within an RCM environment. SSAOs shared even when there are clear administrative priorities in support of the institutional mission that RCM may skew their ability to advocate for more resources.

At NWU SSAOs also felt they were at odds with the central administration and academic schools for positioning student affairs for more resources. NWU SSAOs focus on establishing strong data-driven proposals tied to the institutional mission and also in support of academic schools' priorities. Even though SSAOs focused on tying data to a larger institutional mission, they felt the need to bypass central administration for support and work with academic school leadership and external trustees. The NWU VP of the student union stated, "We just have to keep collecting that data to illustrate our value and then trying to get it up the chain." The NWU VP responsible for the campus union explained further that data must be linked to the educational mission, a constructivist frame, but that collecting data is not enough if student affairs is not part of budget conversations with central administration and academic school leadership. The SSAO stated:

I would say, make sure that you are assessing, that you are evaluating, that you are keeping track of the data, telling your story by using that data, have clearly articulated objectives and outcomes and really tie it to the mission, tying it to the student learning and the student development outcomes and really pay attention to your board of regents or your board of trustees to see which direction they want to take the university so that you can make any type of tweaks or adjustments along the way. (NWU #1)

For me, when it comes to the decision making again it's, how is this aligning with our mission, our values, our priorities. Is it effective in what we want to accomplish? Working with the academic units, is this something that is a need within, which they're seeing with their students specifically. (NWU #1)

Another NWU SSAO stated a similar position. The SSAOs shared they needed to prioritize decision making in the acquisition of campus resources using a political framework to circumvent the central administration to influence academic school leadership to support student affairs stating:

Education is so important and what the role student affairs has is critical and we need to just be figuring out how we can increase our resources every possible way. Especially in partnerships with colleges, it's critical and we got to get us at table with the [academic school] deans. I do think that the data collection and really especially related to ... People are saying we're graduating these students but they don't have the skills to do the job and we know that we can provide that skillset to the students outside the classroom so we need to start talking about that and we need to work with employers and other people and really get the message, in my opinion, to the highest level, which would be the board of regents and board of trustees, to really understand they have to reshape how we use our resources on our campuses, if that makes sense. That's why I've got myself going to our board or regents [trustees] in May to talk about the co-curricular transcript. If I get to them first and up there and get them excited, then it's going to have to trickle to the colleges [academic schools]. (NWU #1)

It appears that NWU SSAOs have little trust in the central administration or even academic school leadership but rather are working outside of these relationships to gain external support for student affairs.

The MWU and NWU SSAOs had distinct variances in how they viewed their ability to carry out the institutional mission in and RCM environment. However, both case studies suggest that the central administration is not helpful in accessing more resources for student affairs. Both cases studies also suggest that SSAOs pay attention to the institution mission, however, they also pay close attention to individual academic schools needs as well. In Chapter Five, the SSAOs decision making will be categorized as either adapting to the external environment and/or maintaining their prioritization of the institutional mission.

NWU SSAOs had similar insights especially regarding how they were relied on for training and crisis services. At NWU, SSAOs had similar responses to how central administration and academic schools value student affairs services especially in times of crisis. A SSAO shared:

I think that's been kind of a fight for us. I think when there's a time of crisis we're called upon right away and of course we're handling the mental health needs and a lot of the diversity inclusions kinds of things so they were relied on heavily by the colleges but when it comes to trying to get the resources it's a battle. (NWU #3)

How central administration and academic school leadership perceive the importance of student affairs programs and services vary dramatically within a RCM model. NWU SSAOs stated:

When I think about the deans in the academic colleges I don't think that they always have as much understanding of what we do and our value to both the university at large and to students. I think they feel like a lot of what we provide is duplicated through various student services that are provided at the collegiate level. (NWU #3)

I think it's because it's the university is run by a bunch of academics. You've got to be faculty and have the credentials and if you don't have that, you're not existent. You hear that all the time, "We're here. Without the faculty and without our research we'd be nothing and there's no value in what we provide for the students," although that's what exciting about the Collegiate Link [co-curricular transcript] and some of those things is we just have to keep collecting that data to illustrate our value and then trying to get it up the chain. (NWU #2)

I think right now we go through this whole compact process and I think we've been up against, and because we report directly to the provost we're constantly competing against the academic side of the house and I think one of the things, at least with my background, that I wish we would have more flexibility with is looking at student services fees kinds of things. In our area a lot of campuses are doing fundraising, especially with leadership development kinds of things and we are not allowed right now since I've been here the academic side is the priority so I would say if we could have more opportunities to generate more revenues and especially being on the corporate side of life like with our career services and internship area and then some more flexibility with student service fees because I think the students are more amenable in the understanding of how important we are to their success versus the academic side, if that makes sense. (NWU #2)

The NWU SSAOs, when asked if they see the academic schools' value and relationship with student affairs grew, changed, and/or diminished, stated:

I think it has changed through the years based on the leadership within our division. I think that's been kind of a fight for us. I think when there's a time of crisis we're called upon right away and of course we're handling the mental health needs and a lot of the diversity inclusions kinds of things so they were relied on heavily by the colleges but when it comes to trying to get the resources it's a battle. I have seen recently as the voice of our student government getting out there saying, "We have these needs," is helping to get resources for student affairs but it's not the long term commitment. It's like, "Okay, we'll plug the hole here. We'll give you some money to hire five mental health counselors," but then a year later you're back to the drawing board. It's hard to get that sustainable funding. That's our battle constantly on this campus. (NWU #2)

Another NWU SSAO shared that there are stronger connections to some academic schools versus others. They commented:

I would say our strongest relationships are with our liberal arts, our college of education and public affairs and mostly those schools because they tend to have that student development background. Liberal arts tends to be your largest college and so you have more interaction with them and because it's just proximity...so I think our relationships are stronger with those units. I would also throw in college of biological sciences but I think that goes back to relationships that have been developed over the years. I would say more recently has been student affairs team members reaching out to the academic unit but again I think it also depends on what college or unit. (NWU #1)

The NWU SSAOs perceptions of their relationships with academic schools seemed to be more awkward and frustrating than at MWU. MWU SSAOs by and large spoke to a collegial relationship where academic school student affairs staff were viewed as an "extension" of student affairs. However, at NWU, SSAOs seem to struggle with academic school relationships thus having to create liaison roles and memorandums of understanding to define their relationships with academic schools.

Overall, at both case study sites, student affairs is valued at academic schools for crisis management, training, and resources support. However, SSAOs were quick to

point out that not all academic schools value student affairs in the same way. In general, the value placed on student affairs seems to be neutral or one of competition. SSAOs reflected that academic schools that had grown student affairs services seemed to be more positive.

Little evidence was gathered about how student affairs was valued by the central administration. Although SSAOs were asked about their relationship with the central administration, more of the discussion was focused on academic schools and how SSAOs felt about their relationships. Therefore, the majority of the time spent on this exploratory study was developing insights into how SSAOs viewed their academic colleagues from the inductive processes. More work and focused questions on the relationship with the central administration valuing of student affairs is necessary to present clear findings.

Chapter V: Implications

Findings in this exploratory study create a new understanding of the RCM budget model's impact on student affairs decision making and provide a framework for how other central utilities may think about partnering with academic schools. The findings detail SSAOs' perceptions of changes to student affairs structures, delivery of services, and how student affairs prioritize and position themselves for more resources in an RCM environment. SSAOs at both of the large research institutions indicated that they were challenged by RCM budget and planning model. SSAOs observe that while they try their best to maintain a Constructivist approach that maintains student affairs values and mission, they practice an Adaptive approach which augments student affairs functions and services in a RCM model to gain more resources. SSAOs adjust student affairs functions to both academic schools' priorities and externally driven forces, such as legal compliance. SSAOs further explained that the RCM budget model led select units to distort missions, reposition themselves for more resources, create training programs for academic school-based student affairs services, embed student affairs within academic schools, and develop liaison roles with academic schools. SSAOs on both campuses overwhelmingly felt that RCM allowed for, and/or led to, functions in student affairs being replicated in academic schools. SSAOs were concerned that once student affairs functions and services are replicated, it becomes a challenge for student affairs who then have to assess, adapt, and form distinct relationships with each academic school.

This chapter includes three sections: a recap of main points of the literature, an analysis of the results, and a discussion of the exploratory study implications followed by recommendations for student affairs' navigation of RCM. The first main points section

will include a brief overview of concepts from the literature. The RCM literature discusses advantages and possible disadvantages of the RCM model. The literature notes that RCM has created academic school capacity to positively impact efficiencies, effectiveness, and creativity when solving academic problems, such as retention. The literature also discusses clear disadvantages such as exacerbating duplication and mission distortion.

The second analysis section will consider if the data presented in Chapter Four may be categorized as either Constructive, Adaptive, and/or a combination of these concepts. Chaffee's Adaptive and/or Constructive model (1983, 1985) is used as a framework for interpreting the exploratory data. The Constructive Decision-making Model bases one's decision on the mission and values of the institution by staying congruent with the mission regardless of external forces acting upon the organization. The Adaptive mode changes SSAOs' decision making to be sensitive to external forces other than the stated mission and purpose of student affairs and/or the institutional mission. The Adaptive model motivates student affairs leaders to make decisions that tend to move student affairs programs and services toward these external pressures at the cost of the organizational mission and values whereas the Constructive model simply maintains a commitment to the mission and values of student affairs.

The third and final discussion section will discuss implications and goals for future research. The implications include a number of SSAO communication strategies and structural changes to help student affairs navigate and thrive in RCM budget environments. Finally, in the conclusion, gaps in research and thoughts for future research are shared.

Section I: Recap of Literature Review

The RCM literature clearly describes its strengths and challenges. The RCM budget model enables and incentivizes decision makers to focus on expenses and ways to generate revenue (Curry, Laws, & Strauss, 2013; Massy, 1996; Whalen, 1991). In addition, this model incentivizes academic schools to create revenue and decrease expenses that best solve their most pressing problems (Straus & Curry, 2013; Volpatti, 2013). Academic schools and student affairs using RCM make financial decisions for efficiency, innovation, and effectiveness (Priest & Boon 2006; Strauss & Curry, 2002; Whalen, 1991). Due to there being little research showing how student affairs leaders navigate RCM, a brief review of the literature is shared to review concepts which will inform the interpretation of the findings. This summary discusses the advantages and disadvantages of RCM, followed by the organizational concepts RCM affects, and concludes with recommendations from scholars on successful implementations as well as warnings about the RCM model.

RCM Advantages

The RCM literature explains the positive impact the system has on institutional entrepreneurship, efficiency, and effectiveness. Specifically, RCM systems have a positive impact on academic schools' retention and course production (Hearn et al., 2006; Priest & Boon, 2006; Strauss & Curry, 2006; Whalen, 1991). In the RCM model, academic deans develop solutions to academic problems as a result of their proximal knowledge coupled with their control of financial resources to solve challenges (Gold, Golden, & Quatroche, 1993; Hoover, 2011; Volpatti, 2013).

RCM Disadvantages

Critics of RCM have noted that institutional mission can be compromised. RCM increases corporate-like approaches which has been documented in compromising institutional mission, values, and structure (Adams, 1997; Breneman, 2002; Kezar & Eckel, 2008; Murray, 2000; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1974, 2003). Other researchers warn RCM may grow into a corrupt system that is concerned with revenues, costs, and a culture of rationality that loses sight of educational mission (Adams, 1997; Whalen, 1991). The RCM model creates a new system that focuses professionals on being territorial, competitive, and thinking less about institutional goals. Their new goal becomes focused on how to create student affairs functions as an effort to solve localized problems through innovation. (Douglass, 2013; Hearn, 2006; Hoover, 2011; Stocum & Rooney, 1997).

A seemingly positive impact of RCM is innovation; however, innovation can quickly become a challenge if it replicates student affairs functions (Breneman, 1993; Cole, 1993). Scholars have noted that academic schools may replicate student affairs functions even though they already pay for these services (Curry, Laws & Strauss, 2013; Strauss & Curry, 2002) and may knowingly or unknowingly recreate student affairs services (Breneman, 2002; Massy, 1990). Further compounding the concern for how student affairs struggles in RCM is how a campus' culture affirms academic decision making (Bugeja, 2012; Rhoades, 2001; Strauss & Curry, 2002). Institutional cultures that affirm academic school decision making most likely will pose a distinct disadvantage for student affairs. How SSAOs make decisions in RCM is key to its success and/or its failure as an efficiency and effectiveness model. Key concepts from organizational

literature will also be reviewed to undergird the findings from the case studies, as there is little empirical research to show how student affairs leaders think and act in a RCM model.

Organizational Literature

RCM has an effect on organization constructs including size, ambiguity, loose-coupling, interdependence, and replication. Morgan (2006) discussed how the large size of institutions has a tendency to decentralize decision making. In large and complex organizations, departmental missions may be purposely left ambiguous in an effort to adapt to ever changing internal and external priorities (Bess & Dee, 2008). Baldrige et al. (1977) asserted that campus decision makers purposely leave departmental roles ambiguous to avoid conflict. In an RCM system, ambiguity can create space for academic schools and student affairs to also replicate functions (Kuk & Banning, 2009; Mason & Eldridge, 2010).

Goal ambiguity may also result in an organizational loose-coupling between academic schools and student affairs (Weick, 1976). The advantage of autonomous, loosely-coupled organizations with ambiguous roles is that decision making is sensitive and responsive, enabling academic schools and student affairs to make collaborative but independent decisions (Bess & Dee, 2008; Morgan, 2006; Whalen, 1991; Wieck, 1976). This is especially true in eras of change, to create greater autonomy and more innovation. Priest and Boon (2006) highlighted that RCM enhances autonomy to develop creative solutions to academic problems. Strauss and Curry (2002) warned, however, that too loose of a coupling may also create a lack of financial responsibility. RCM is known to dilute interdependence between schools and departments (Bensimon, Neumann, &

Birnbaum, 1989; Morgan, 2006) and a lack of interdependency in a loosely coupled institution may result in academic schools and student affairs developing into independent silos that have limited connection (Bess & Dee, 2008). Therefore, academic school and student affairs leaders who neglect interdependent decision making may increase the chances for duplication of student affairs functions (Bess & Dee, 2008; Dubeck, 1984; Meisinger & Dubeck, 1984; Whalen, 1991).

Student Affairs Literature

There is a shortage of literature on how SSAOs navigate RCM, even though student affairs is known to solve problems with which academic schools are concerned such as student retention and persistence (Engstrom & Tinto, 2000; Hearn et al., 2006; Porterfield, Roper & Whitt, 2011; Priest & Boon, 2006; Scott & Bischoff, 2000; Torres & Walbert, 2010). Contemporary articles call for student affairs to align themselves with the institutional mission (Torres & Walbert, 2010; Varlotta, 2010; Whalen, 1991), while some select, current articles draw a distinction between academic and institution missions and priorities (Harrison, 2010; Porter, 2013). Student affairs leaders may need to decide between academic schools or institutional priorities to gain more resources in a RCM system (Ardaiolo, 2010; Barr, 2002; Deanna, 2001; Kuk & Banning, 2009; Levy, 1995; Schuch, 2003; Varlotta, 2010). Scholars suggest that it is paramount for student affairs organizations to gather data and then communicate it with academic school and central administration decision makers (Ardaiolo, 2010; Kuk & Banning, 2009; Mason & Eldridge, 2010; Porterfield, Roper, & Whitt, 2011; Scott & Bischoff, 2000). Evans (2011) called for the study of institutional leadership's arbitration between competing institutional and academic school missions, in the budget and planning processes. More

specifically, student affairs leaders must be sensitive to both academic school and institutional priorities as well as the relationship of external forces as SSAOs make decisions (Ardaiolo, 2010; Banning & Kuh, 2009; Harrison, 2010; Rhoades, 2001; Varlotta, 2010).

RCM Prerequisites

Priest and Boon (2006) warned that RCM needs careful management and a focus on academic school accountability, especially in an era of declining resources (Burke, 2005). Whalen (1991) cautioned that RCM system may not function as intended without close attention to the design of appropriate cost-sharing mechanisms between central administration, student affairs, and academic schools. As an example, academic schools may view student affairs departments as inefficient, costly, and duplicative.

Authors and early analysts of RCM cautioned that entrepreneurship must be kept in check with clear rules for central services, such as student affairs, to not be circumvented (Strauss 2002; Whalen 1991). Additionally, they asserted that clear rules may not be enough as they can become the focus rather than overall institutional mission. Researchers call for a consistent commitment from the central administration to provide rigorous management over academic schools to prevent replication of student affairs functions (Curry, Laws, & Strauss, 2013; Priest & Boon, 2006; Strauss 2002;). Whalen (1991) and Strauss (2002) stated, however, that goal clarity and rules are not enough and therefore suggest RCM needs more oversight. SSAOs may need to think about navigating both the personal relationships with academic schools and central administration as much as they do the RCM rules for which the system uses as control. Simply said, SSAO decision makers must juggle multiple relationships as well as decide

between institutional and or academic schools' priorities to successfully navigate RCM model.

Strauss (2002) stressed a successful RCM implementation needs a periodic reset of budget planning rules and audits must be planned to be successful. Student Affairs leaders may need to advocate for these reviews if the central administration misses these necessary opportunities to rest priorities, rules, and even prior decision making (Bess & Dee, 2008; Giddens, 1979; Kaplan, 2006;).

SSAOs need to understand the organizational context in order to successfully navigate the RCM environment. A balance of prioritizing the missions of the academic school and institution is important. Additionally, a firm understanding of organizational concepts affecting or exacerbating RCM are key for SSAOs to consider when navigating RCM. SSAOs need to think about mission, organizational concepts, budget rules, and relationships in order to make critical decisions within a RCM environment.

When SSAOs are considering mission the literature from Chaffee's (1983, 1985) Decision Making theory provides for a conceptual framework. Chaffee's framework provides an analytical lens to organizational decision making. Decisions are categorized as Adaptive and Constructive decision making (Chaffee, 1983, 1985; Mintzberg, 1973; Wieck, 1976;). SSAOs who implement Adaptive decision making create new systems, structures, and services to respond to external forces. SSAOs who maintain a Constructivist framework defend current structures and systems in order to stay focused on internal values and missions. An analysis of student affairs leaders' decisions will be categorized using the Adaptive and/or the Constructive model. Will SSAOs decision making maintain their values or will they adapt to academic units' values and goals?

In summary, current literature warns central administration to review RCM governance and academic school interdependency to limit function duplication. Literature points to considerable warnings for a distortion of RCM. Limited research discusses perceptions let alone how SSAOs should lead in and RCM budget environment. Current literature does discuss how student affairs leaders have had to rethink their mission and purpose to survive budget cuts (Ardaiolo, 2010; Barr, 2002; Harrison, 2010; Varlotta, 2010) and how SSAOs are having to make hard decisions on what functions to emphasis (Barr, 2002; Deanna, 2001; Harrison, 2010). Because little is known about how student affairs leaders make their decisions within a RCM system (Evans, 2011; Gold, Golden, & Quatroche, 1993; Priest, St. John, & Tobin, 2002; Straus & Curry, 2013; Volpatti 2013) the findings from this exploratory study will build on the literature from RCM, organizational concepts embedded in RCM, and scholarly critiques of successful implementation of RCM.

Section II: SSAOs' Adaptive Versus Constructive Decision Making

SSAOs maintain they try their best to keep a Constructivist Decision Making framework. However, they begrudgingly reflect that Adaptive Decision Making enables student affairs to create more resources. In an era of static budget or budget reductions, SSAOs discuss that decisions that clearly connect with externally driven forces are areas where student affairs make successful arguments for more resources – especially within a RCM budget environment. It is important to note that SSAOs' perception of their services and functions differed by departments. In the inductive process, SSAOs were quick to point out that not all student affairs decision making was either constructive or

adaptive but rather they possessed qualities of both constructive and adaptive decision making.

SSAOs view select student affairs functions as having distinct disadvantages when making constructivist decisions. As a collective, SSAOs interviewed were critical of the RCM budget model as it hampered their ability to make decisions using a constructive decision making model as described by Chaffee (1983, 1985). In both case studies, SSAOs tried to make all of their decisions within and for the constructive stated mission of student affairs which connect to the institutional mission. SSAOs discussed how important it was to embed student affairs decision making in the mission and values of the institution especially when trying to position units for more resources. However, SSAOs who oversaw mostly non-revenue generating student affairs units shared that while the institutional mission was important, general fund units were at a disadvantage in RCM because their activities are not readily measured in ways that are appreciated in an RCM model. One SSAO captured this sentiment by stating:

You can see where ... because we might look at our budgeting from a different level of unit of analysis than the provost office might, that we really were looking at the same things and seeing different things. That's where some of our adaptation has needed to occur is sort of appreciating a point of view that says, "All money is green," and not saying, "Oh, no, no, but this one is this shade and we do this with this shade and we do this with the other shade." To that point, because all money is green and you raise the point of sort of entrepreneurial ideas and plans, I think that our staff has gotten, by sort of necessity, much more creative in thinking about what is our value and how might we be able to leverage that in some way? Not necessarily monetize but leverage it in some way. (MWU #3).

Further, SSAOs feel that funding easily quantifiable, externally driven risk management, student safety, or compliance initiatives cause student affairs to adapt its decision making. As SSAOs stated in the following quote the current environment is risk averse and compliance driven, stating:

Yeah. Well, I tend to describe the environment as risk averse and so therefore, positioning around what's getting funded is compliance and risk management and those kind of stuffs. Helping folks be really attentive to where we have those risks because (a) they may get funded, things might get funded and (b) us not servicing what's needed could result in problems that the university is less interested in occurring. There's coaching around the environment, the context, what might get funded, what the university will not tolerate if it occurs. That's sort of a leadership coaching, a positioning, helping folks think about their roles in the context of scarcity, economic scarcity but resources for certain things. (MWU #1)

There's times when it definitely feels like the money flows when the external, you almost have to because x, y or z happens, or there's the threat of some sort of risk management or compliance based need. (MWU #2)

SSAOs reported that RCM favors units which have a direct connection to compliance and safety decision making as part of an institution's appeasement of external forces, thus making adaptive decision making. SSAOs must adapt their practice for more campus resources, but at the same time maintain a constructivist framework in their advocacy.

RCM is well known for creating efficiencies and effectiveness which includes reducing costs and increasing entrepreneurial behavior. Within student affairs, SSAOs reflected that non-compliance areas need to develop strong proposals that connect with the institutional mission. However, even with clear evidentiary data to back up these proposals, SSAOs are not successful in gaining more resources from the central administration except for externally driven risk management related areas. An SSAO emphasized the adaptive decision making by stating:

We have not received more allocations from the university except in highly strategic areas... that generally have to do with student risk and safety. We're in an environment, and have been for a number of years, where really the only things that attract attention for budget support are those things which if not funded are enormously risky or prevent student safety. Mental health, sexual assault prevention and response, Greek life, trying to think of some other areas. Those are then big areas of support, is when we can say we have a national standard around counseling or we have a demand that we can't meet and students and others need, have sort of an acute reality with mental health issues... Really, our positioning has been one around risk management, student safety, or compliance. (MWU #1)

I think another way that it [RCM] affects decision making is, it might cause units to distort their mission or their request for funding based on, for example, right now we know, as I mentioned earlier that risk management compliance and things

are those things that get funded. Units might distort their work or distort their rationale for budget requests based on what the likelihood of being funded. I think is one of the things they can do. It might, I think in some cases, has caused people to seek data, because in an RCM kind of environment, very data driven, it causes people to seek data that rationalizes a request for funding. (MWU #1)

The external pressure for SSAOs to make compliance-driven decisions is exacerbated in a RCM environment. SSAOs reflected that in an effort to link their activity with risk management, the non-compliance student affairs units are starting to distort missions and decision making in order to gain more resources. This is important evidence: In an RCM model, SSAOs use adaptive decision making because of external levers. They make decisions in order increase resources and/or decrease losses, and consider these more important than institutional mission.

An additional example is that RCM encourages SSAOs to adapt their decision making in a practice of selling courses to academic schools. The motivation for SSAOs to sell courses to academic schools starts out from a constructivist motivation but changes to an adaptive framework in order to increase revenue. When teaching courses takes precedence over constructivist student affairs work it becomes an example of an adaptation of SSAO decision making in order to gain more student affairs resources. A strong example is SSAOs at both institutions shared that student affairs offered and taught leadership courses for compensation.

Overall, SSAOs maintain that RCM makes it more difficult for student affairs organizations to maintain a constructive framework for decision making. SSAOs believe that RCM advantages units that have clear and tangible data, are compliance driven and focused on generating revenue. SSAOs worry that in an RCM environment there is

increased motivation to distort enduring unit level missions toward externally driven motivation such as external compliance and risk management goals.

As Kuh (1996) shared, institutions which care deeply about student learning create seamless educational environments. SSAOs who consider both the institutional mission as well as the value they provide academic schools may be able to bridge the curricular and co-curricular. SSAOs' decision making in an RCM environment may help provide the seamlessness that enhances student learning (Schroeder, 1996). As findings in this study highlight, SSAOs may need to adapt how they structure student affairs for more resources but in doing so should strive to maintain a constructivist framework in creating seamless education experiences between the curricular and co-curricular. The following section will discuss implications for how SSAOs may successfully navigate RCM environments using Kuh's (1996) concept of seamless educational environments and significant insights SSAOs shared in this exploratory study.

Section III: Implications from the Exploratory Study

In this section, a discussion of the reported findings from the exploratory study and literature are used to inform implications for student affairs practice. Practices derived from the exploratory data build on current literature presented in the previous section. In particular, the implications were informed from literature on successful RCM implementation and organizational concepts that impact RCM. The implications also build on real strategies SSAOs in the case studies implemented such as restructuring, adapting, and positioning student affairs for more funding.

The implications may assist the knowledge of how RCM affects student affairs functions, services, and practice. Not only are the following recommendations valuable for SSAOs but also for the education of student affairs professionals. Graduate preparation programs may want to consider program requirements which teach how budget models impact student affairs decision making.

Implications are organized in two sections: recommendations for internal practices for student affairs leaders and recommendations for external relationships with academic schools. In the first section, recommendations to improve SSAOs successful navigation of RCM include: clarifying mission and functions, focusing on health and safety, championing student affairs, and circumventing administrative hierarchy. In the second section, practices to improve student affairs relationships with academic schools' recommendations include: communicating, sharing user-data, forming interdependent relationships, customizing relationships, creating agreements, consulting, selling courses production, and sharing responsibility for involvement and engagement initiatives. In order to successfully navigate a RCM budget model, SSAOs may want to consider implementing some or all of the following strategies. A conclusion will share a reflection regarding student affairs mission in relationship to RCM and a call for future research to build upon this exploratory study.

Clarifying Mission and Student Affairs Functions

Current literature discusses the importance of student affairs' connection to institutional mission, especially in an era of reduced resources. However, in this exploratory study, SSAOs also realized select student affairs services are valued differently by the central administration and academic schools. SSAOs discussed

learning how to prioritize their functions based on the needs of academic schools as well as the central administration. SSAOs also learned that external forces impact how central administration makes decision on resources. SSAOs also need to be responsive to academic school needs so that leadership advocates for the central administration are able to gain more resources. An assessment of which student affairs functions are most utilized and/or replicated by academic schools could assist in SSAOs decision making on prioritizing its functions. A focus on these priority services can give clarity and permission to SSAOs to create a distinct and possibly smaller student affairs portfolio. SSAOs discussed growing depth, not breadth in their programs and services. One SSAO emphasized this concept by saying:

“We need to actually do less, I think. We're not good at stopping work or changing how we do the work. I'm also spending time with folks, auxiliary and non-auxiliary, saying, well what's really essential? Does that matter to the people we're serving? Do we have to do all of those things? I know we've always done 42 programs but do we need 42 programs? That's another thing. Maybe doing a little bit less and being clear about the value to the people we serve. (MWU #1)

In an RCM environment with the assumption that I can't change the budgeting model at the university is to have clarity of mission, to assure that staff effort is fully aligned to that mission, have ways to measure, whatever they are, have ways to measure the outcome, understand if there are metrics or standards or external expectations that guide that work that are useful in making the case for your budget annually. (MWU #1)

A core function of the mission of student affairs is supporting students. The clarity of what is the mission and subsequent functions of central student affairs should be a direct conversation with the central administration, as well as academic school leadership and what aspects of student affairs services can be duplicated. It is important that the state of central and academic schools' student affairs be assessed and clear decisions made on its future growth as the growth of academic schools' student affairs programs and positions are difficult to undo. Clarity on what central student affairs services are essential and it is

incumbent on SSAOs to advocate to the central administration to strongly communicate boundaries with academic schools. As an example, an essential core function of student affairs is managing crisis.

Managing Crisis

SSAOs at both case study sites discussed academic schools' appreciation of student affairs organizations assistance, support, and management of students in crisis. As one SSAO described it, academic schools appreciated student affairs for "walking along side of them" (MWU #2) during acute crises such as a student death. SSAOs agreed that crisis management was a priority endeavor for student affairs that was valued by academic schools. SSAOs thought that academic schools appreciated student affairs for their ability to support them in moments of extreme crisis. Consequently, SSAOs may want to promote crisis management as a key central service. If SSAOs can convince the central administration and academic school leadership to rely on student affairs in moments of crisis, using a constructivist framework, it may enable the promotion of other student affairs functions. SSAOs expressed the delivery of crisis management services to academic schools as an avenue to introduce other related student affairs functions. As crisis management encompasses a variety of student needs, it may be a foundation for building an appreciation for understanding, appreciating, and funding of student affairs. SSAOs that focus on supporting students, families and academic schools through a constructivist framework may carve a clearly defined role with academic schools. In turn, academic schools may value and advocate for student affairs and its services which positively impact the reduction of crisis and a stronger interdependence coupling of student affairs and academic schools. This form of interconnected relationship should

prove valuable to student affairs in attaining resources and reducing academic school competition for crisis support functions as well as building support for crisis issues that affect student's health and safety.

Focusing on Health and Safety

Related to crisis support services is how student affairs supports students' health and safety. SSAOs need to focus on compliance and safety-driven programs and services. SSAOs acknowledge externally driven compliance are affecting student affairs organizations in direct, unique, and dramatic ways. Findings in both case studies highlighted that student affairs not only have better access to resources when SSAOs adapt programs and services to external forces for risk management compliance, but may also receive more funds. SSAOs should work with central administration and academic school leadership to determine what risk management functions may be more important for student affairs to emphasize and enhance such as mental health, alcohol/drug prevention, and sexual misconduct prevention. In each case study, student affairs organizations had a clear focus on health and safety compliance services and programs by embedding services within academic schools as well as offering training and or consulting services for academic schools. SSAOs added that adapting student affairs service to meet external forces of compliance should not be the only strategy for attaining more resources and navigating RCM model.

Championing Student Affairs

Researchers warn that student affairs needs careful management and a focus on academic school accountability for RCM to function as intended. SSAOs need to remind the central administration of the cost for replicating central student affairs functions.

SSAOs should focus on cost-sharing functions between central administration, student affairs, and academic schools. Academic schools may have an extra incentive to reproduce student affairs in RCM, making it paramount for SSAOs to provide data that point out how inefficient, costly, and duplicative academic school growth of student affairs can be. Successful RCM implementation needs a periodic reset of budget planning rules and SSAOs may need to be the administrative watchdog to suggest that it is time for a RCM analysis. Student affairs leaders may need to advocate for these reviews if the central administration misses these necessary opportunities to retune priorities and controls.

Analysts of RCM assert that clear rules and enforcement may not be enough for SSAOs to successfully navigate the model because they can be distorted by academic schools. Therefore, SSAOs must connect with budget affairs leadership and/or the persons in central administration who govern RCM's implementation. This position(s) can be a strong ally for SSAOs. The RCM champion can assist the SSAOs' understanding of budget rules, preferred data, and be a partner with student affairs should academic schools start to reproduce centralized student affairs services. However, SSAOs in this study advised that advocating for rule enforcement may not be enough and more aggressive tactics are needed such as circumventing the administration's budget management processes.

Circumventing Administrative Hierarchy

SSAOs in both case studies expressed a need to work outside of the current communication structures to convince key leadership of student affairs proposals and goals. SSAOs discussed that the central administration budget conversations typically

failed to produce positive schools results for student affairs. As such, SSAOs shared communication strategies that circumvented these structured conversations. Inventive SSAOs utilized students to advocate for student affairs resources as well as trustees to influence the central administration and academic school leadership. SSAOs shared that the disadvantage of the current structures does not allow them to connect to academic school deans. Additionally, SSAOs felt they did not have the right data that could compete with academic schools' proposals. Therefore, SSAOs felt it was paramount for student affairs administrators to mount more radical communication campaigns to reinforce budget proposals with a broader set of advocates, such as students and trustees. SSAOs also shared that some academic schools' leaders value and will advocate for central student affairs. Therefore, the next set of recommendations will focus on SSAOs relationships with academic schools.

Recommendations with Academic Schools

The following are recommendations for SSAOs' decision making and relationships with academic schools. It is incumbent on SSAOs to communicate its mission, purpose, and contributions to academic school's priorities. SSAOs must also note that each academic school may have different priorities and problems to solve as well as different fiscal resources due to RCM model.

Communicating with Academic Schools

Once SSAOs have crystalized their mission to highlight their benefit to academic schools' student affairs, they should create and maintain a robust communication campaign back to academic school leadership. An identification of student affairs contribution may increase how academic schools value its functions and services.

Developing a focused communication program should be a strong priority as they are valued by the administration and academic schools. Repeatedly SSAOs at both case study sites bemoaned the fact that academic school leadership devalued student affairs services. A main feature of the communication program should be data that reflect how academic schools utilize student affairs services.

Sharing User Data with Academic School

SSAOs should report on how student affairs serve academic schools' missions and goals, but also share a breakdown by academic school. SSAOs discussed the need to share data with academic schools to help them realize the size and scope of student affairs contribution to their academic goals. By sharing more detailed information with academic schools, SSAOs would build an appreciation of student affairs that academic schools may dismiss due to a lack of awareness of existing support. SSAOs should monitor and report 'use' statistics to the central administration by academic school. Student statistics per academic school such as counseling services, involvement activities, and student conduct issues could be relevant data for SSAOs to share with the central administration and academic unit leaders if the budgetary tax provided to support student affairs is efficient. As a result, academic school leadership may begin to understand how their tax is utilized and may even become advocates for increasing resources for student affairs to the central administration. Sharing data on how academic schools utilize student affairs functions and services may increase an interconnected relationship with student affairs.

Sense-Making for Academic Schools

In addition to sharing data, student affairs is in an excellent position to interpret data regarding student success. Combining data with expert knowledge of general developmental theories and models can create localized solutions known as sense-making (Bensimon, 2005; Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005). When staff and faculty review grounded theories, models of persistence and retention, and vet data on current students, they may create meaningful adjustments to existing student success programs and services. The organizational learning or sense-making ability of student affairs departments is key to the development of conditions which create student success. If done well, this process can further justify budget resources. For example, a first year English course could double as qualitative assessment for student's adjustment to college. Student affairs analysis and reporting of aggregate data could provide valuable insight into retention strategies to the campus community.

Forming Interdependent Relationships with Academic Schools

SSAOs pointed out that navigating decision making within the RCM system is difficult if they do not have a relationship with academic deans. As an example, SSAOs at both case study sites discussed that they were not invited to key budget conversations and decision-making forums with central administration and academic deans. SSAOs shared the lack of access to budget meetings with academic school leadership relationships was a significant challenge. Student affairs leadership should have a part to play within the budget proposal of all non-teaching staff at the college level (Lovell & Kosten, 2000). To punctuate this, one SSAO discussed the need for student affairs to have a seat at the table to try to influence deans during budget construction, but then

admitted that they were autonomous in their ability to duplicate student affairs positions.

They stated:

Imagine if academic schools would have to pass through a central student affairs budget committee process to articulate the growth of these positions. Even if academic schools were still autonomous in spending their resources in growing these positions, the committee could forecast which schools had and do not have the student affairs positions. (NMU #1)

As it is likely that institutions' RCM budget and planning processes do not include this level of scrutiny, SSAOs should focus on understanding each academic school's needs and augment central student affairs staff services in order to prevent individual academic schools' replication of programs and services. If SSAOs neglect this duty, it may result in more aggressive and faster duplication of central student affairs functions. A joint committee of student affairs, central administration, and academic school leadership could regularly manage student affairs services as a preventive strategy. Another more in-depth strategy is forming organizational teams across student affairs and academics schools' organizations.

Network Solutions with Academic Schools

Student affairs should adopt "network organizational" teams comprised of staff in academic schools who perform related and or similar functions such as all staff who are concerned about retention of students (Kezar & Eckel, 2008; Kuk & Banning, 2009). A network organization solution may be ideal where there is a high level of trust and similar work functions. In order for network organization to be successful, members will need to be legitimized by the campus administration. The campus leadership will also need to embed larger institutional philosophies into networking solutions. Network organizations can help curb the growth of academic school student affairs while at the same time help

student affairs achieve its mission through work with academic schools' staff and resources. As an example, they may provide fiscal saving and create economy of scale on shared projects and technology purchases. Academic schools' value of student affairs may vary, however, by each academic school.

Customizing Relationships with Academic Schools

SSAOs should assess which functions are most valued by academic schools and foster targeted relationships with select student affairs areas. SSAOs in this study discussed that not all academic schools had the same perspective and value of student affairs services. SSAOs shared that academic schools needs varied because some schools have limited capacity to duplicate student affairs services. SSAOs in this study suggested developing formal relationship statements or joint operating agreements with academic schools. More research needs to be completed more deeply analyze which student affairs functions and services trend toward either Adaptive or Constructive decision making as a result of RCM.

Creating Agreements with Academic Schools

SSAOs further suggested developing customized relationship statements between student affairs and academic schools for what is centralized student affairs and what is student affairs-grown as well as paid for by academic schools in the RCM system. SSAOs discussed formalizing the relationship with academic deans. The formalization of select student affairs functions varied from training programs, liaisons, fiscal compensation agreements, and other agreements outlining student affairs relationships with academic schools. The clarity of which academic school services are needed could help focus SSAO decision making and develop stronger partnership with schools with

limited ability to grow student affairs. An example SSAOs at both institutions discussed was an evolution of student affairs staff as experts that assist academic schools to deal with persistence and retention issues.

Consulting with Academic Schools

If it is inevitable that academic schools replicate student affairs functions in order to assist in solving localized problems such as persistence and retention, then SSAOs may consider evolving and provide consulting and training support to academic schools' student affairs staff. SSAOs may choose to minimize their staff but maximize their impact by hiring higher caliber, credentialed staff. These highly-trained and educated staff can then provide support to academic student affairs staff. Examples from the case studies included monthly academic school staff training programs, individual consulting meetings, and student affairs liaisons to academic schools. SSAOs shared that student affairs can better position itself by becoming experts in student affairs services such as technology, crisis support, and even pedagogical support for lower level course production. SSAOs at both case study sites made decisions to adapt student affairs services and functions to teach courses for revenue.

Selling Teaching to Academic Schools

RCM is known for creating entrepreneurial behavior within academic schools. However, this study also found that RCM generates entrepreneurial behavior in student affairs. SSAOs at both case study sites discussed selling the instruction of leadership and diversity courses back to academic schools to gain more fiscal resources. SSAOs may want to consider hiring staff with specific skills in curriculum development as well as teaching skills. The ability to sell back low cost instruction to academic schools may

enable student affairs not only to meet the mission of supporting personal development and diversity goals but also to assist in supporting traditionally non-revenue generating student affairs units with added income. Student affairs staff who support course production are in a position to assist in the formal development of relationships with academic schools. SSAOs claimed that teaching leadership and diversity course for revenue was a way to maintain a constructivist mentality that adapted how services are delivered. Ironically, as student affairs staff have started to teach academic courses, student affairs embedded in academic schools has started to replicate involvement and engagement programs.

Involvement and Engagement Changes to Academic Schools

Select academic areas, in both case studies, increased involvement and engagement programs to increase academic school retention. SSAOs perceived that academic schools' desire to grow involvement and engagement functions that are directly linked to their persistence and retention agenda in order to increase course production. For that reason, SSAOs may consider stronger academic school partnerships for the delivery of leadership and engagement activities. SSAOs believed RCM incentivizes student affairs to grow within academic schools which creates a competitive dynamic with academic school. Therefore, SSAOs may consider revising and /or reducing their student involvement and engagement functions instead of competing with academic schools.

A constructivist approach to academic schools' growth of involvement and engagement may take the form of support by offering expertise, training, and consulting to academic schools. SSAOs may enhance their involvement functions by becoming co-

curricular experts which convene, train, and consult with academic student affairs staff. Whereas an adaptive approach to academic schools may include reducing or relinquishing student affairs' involvement and engagement functions to academic schools. SSAOs may consider how to minimize their involvement in supporting such activities as leadership development and student organization advising to academic school student affairs staff. SSAOs who acquiesce to academic schools' involvement and engagement agenda can build capacity for other functional areas.

Depending on the structure of student affairs organizations these options may be a natural evolution of how the RCM has allowed for academic schools to grow student affairs services to solve local retention and persistence problems. A revised relationship of this important co-curricular education role may be to empower student affairs to be a better educational partner with academic schools. Future research should focus on academic schools' perception of what student affairs functions should be, as maintained by central student affairs, and which should be either replicated and/or moved to academic schools. Research is necessary to understand why RCM enables and incentivizes duplication in academic schools.

Conclusion

Student affairs organizations contribute to the institutional and academic schools' missions by providing a seamless educational experience for students (Kuh, 1996). In order to fulfill its mission, SSAOs must be able to position student affairs for more resources. The funding for higher education, especially funding at state supported universities, has remained largely unchanged for decades, so institutions are turning toward corporate-like approaches to manage budgets. The RCM budget model

incentivizes academic schools to both generate revenue and be keenly aware of academic problems such as the retention of students and course production. As RCM becomes more established at more universities, academic schools may become more autonomous over their budget and planning they can easily replicate student affairs.

This study adds to the RCM literature and begins to fill a gap in the literature regarding SSAOs' navigation of the RCM. SSAOs in this exploratory study offer new understanding of the RCM budget model's effect on student affairs decision making. The importance of understanding budget models and how they impact student affairs decision making further adds to the literature discussion. Graduate higher education and student affairs preparation programs may find the study valuable for helping new student affairs professionals understand that budget models can and do impact decision making. Therefore, graduate program curriculums may want to consider exploring how different budget models function and change student affairs structure and delivery.

SSAOs in the study tried to maintain a constructivist framework as they guided their functions and services. However, leaders also discussed using an adaptive agenda in how they manage student affairs, especially in trying to garner resources. Moreover, SSAOs believed the RCM model affects their decision making to adapt to externally driven forces such as health, safety, and risk management compliance as well as prioritizing academic schools' concerns over that of the institution's priorities.

RCM literature emphasizes the importance of institutional mission in order to make critical decisions within the budget model. SSAOs concurred with RCM literature stating that they want to link decision making to the institutional mission. However, SSAO in this study shared that they needed to decide between institutional mission,

external forces, and academic schools' priorities to successfully navigate their RCM models. SSAOs in this exploratory study overwhelmingly stated that student affairs must adapt to academic schools, as well as external forces, to advocate for more resources.

SSAOs' sensitivity and adaptation of its functions and services to support academic schools was not always in done in an adaptive framework but rather with constructivist motivation. However, SSAOs also conceded that the impact on their decision making was more of an adaptive approach. Although SSAOs stressed the importance to maintain a constructivist perspective, they acknowledged the need to incorporate an adaptive framework to become successful in gaining more resources. SSAOs seemed to be caught between a constructivist perspective to maintain support for institutional mission and an adaptive framework to support academic school priorities.

SSAOs discussed that RCM is changing how student affairs organizations are structured and delivered. More empirical research needs to describe changes to student affairs units as a result of RCM budget model. Research can further investigate if the strategies of how student affairs organizations position themselves for more resources are replicated in different types of institutions other than large research universities. It would additionally be valuable to understand the cost of the replication of student affairs by academic schools. Although RCM is touted to assist in solving local academic problems, the model may indeed cost the institution more money. SSAOs discussed how important it is to form positive and distinct relationships with academic schools. Future research may also include developing models for SSAOs to categories the distinct relationships with academic schools.

Overall, SSAOs explained RCM budget model led select units to distort missions toward compliance and safety, reposition themselves for more resources, create training programs for academic school-based student affairs services, embed student affairs within academic schools, and develop liaison roles with academic schools. SSAOs at both of the large research institutions that were studied indicated that they were challenged by RCM budget and planning model. In conclusion, SSAOs champion a constructivist approach as they rethink how to adapt the structure, delivery, and position of student affairs for more resources in an RCM environment. The budget model provides significant challenges to student affairs. SSAOs in this study echoed the warnings taken from the analysis of RCM budget model. Keen SSAOs can not only navigate the system but also increase their resources and positioning of student affairs to support a seamless educational experience for students.

The dire fiscal challenges facing higher education offer opportunities for student affairs departments to rethink their alignment with the institutional mission and academic college priorities. Student affairs has the opportunity to increase efficiency, raise revenues, and deliver essential support and services. However, to realize these goals the campus administration and academic departments must have clarity on the role of student affairs in supporting students, advocating for them, and creating conditions for their success within and outside of the classroom. What is at stake in this campus dialogue regarding impact of RCM model on student affairs is both fiscal efficiencies in a turbulent fiscal environment and a definition of who is responsible for supporting the institutional mission.

References

- Adams, E.M. (1997). Rationality in the academy why responsibility center budgeting is a wrong step down the wrong road. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 29(5), 58-61.
- Ardaiole, F.P. (2010). Preserving the future from the demands of the present. *New Directions for Student Services*, 129, 71-79. doi: 10.1002/ss.352
- Archibald, R.B., & Feldman, D.H. (2008). Why do higher-education costs rise more rapidly than prices in general?. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 40(3), 25-31.
- Baldrige, J.V. (1971). Models of University Governance: Bureaucratic, Collegial, and Political.
- Baldrige, J.V., Curtis, D.V., Ecker, G.P., & Riley, G.L. (1977). Alternative models of governance in higher education. *Governing academic organizations*, 2-25.
- Banning, J.H., & Kuk, L. (2009). The student affairs organizational dissertation: A bounded qualitative meta-study. *College Student Journal*, 43(2), 258-268.
- Banta, T.W., & Kuh, G.D. (1998). A missing link in assessment: Collaboration between academic and student affairs professionals. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 30(2), 40-46.
- Barr, N. (2002). Financing higher education in the UK: The 2003 White Paper. *House of commons education and skills committee. Post-16 student support. Session, 3*.
- Becker, W.E., Hossler, D., & St John, E.P. (2002). *Incentive-based budgeting systems in public universities*. Northampton, MA: E. Elgar.
- Bensimon, E.M. (2005). Closing the achievement gap in higher education: An organizational learning perspective. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2005 (131), 99-111.
- Bensimon, E.M., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1991). Higher education and leadership theory. *Organization and governance in higher education*, 14, 389-388.
- Bess, J.L., & Dee, J.R. (2008). *Understanding college and university organization: Dynamics of the system* (Vol. 2). Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Birnbaum, R. (2000). *Management fads in higher education: Where they come from, what they do, why they fail*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Boverini, L.C. (2005). *When venture philanthropy rocks the ivory tower: An examination of high impact donors and their potential for higher education development.*
- Breneman, D.W. (2002, June 14). For colleges, this is not just another recession. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 48(40), 7-12.
- Breneman, D.W. (2009). US higher education and the current recession. *International Higher Education*, 55, 2.
- Bugeja, M.J. (2012, May 29). Stamping out rubber stamp collegiality. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/article-content/131946/>
- Burke, J.C. (2005). *Achieving accountability in higher education: Balancing public, academic, and market demands.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cekic, O. (2008). *Responsibility center management and cultural change at a public higher education institution* (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University).
- Clark, B.R. (1960). *The open door college: A case study.*
- Clark, B.R. (2004). Delineating the character of the entrepreneurial university. *Higher Education Policy*, 17, 355-370.
- Cohen, M.D., and March, J.G. (1986). *Leadership and Ambiguity.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Cole, J.R. (1993). Balancing acts: dilemmas of choice facing research universities. *Daedalus*, 122(4), 1-36.
- Creswell, J.W. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Curry, J.R., Laws, A.L., & Strauss, J.C. (2013). *Responsibility center management, a guide to balancing academic entrepreneurship with fiscal responsibility.* National Association of College and University Business Officers.
- Dennison, G.M. (2003). Privatization: An unheralded trend in public higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 28(1), 7-20.
- Dill, D.D. (1984). The nature of administrative behavior in higher education. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 20(3), 69-99.

- Dubeck, L. (1984). Beware of higher ed's newest budget twist. *Thought & Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal*. Washington, D.C.: NEA Communications Services.
- Ehrenberg, R.G. (2006). The perfect storm and the privatization of public higher education. *Change: The magazine of higher learning*, 38(1), 46-53.
- Engstrom, C.M., & Tinto, V. (2000). Developing partnerships with academic affairs to enhance student learning. *The handbook of student affairs administration*, 425-452.
- Evans, S.T. (2011). *Planning for a decentralized budget model: Anticipating change in higher education*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/evans_stuart_t_201112_edd.pdf
- Gansemer-Topf, A.M., & Englin, P.D. (2015). Contemporary challenges in student affairs budgeting and finance. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2015(151), 63-78.
- Geiger, R. (2015). Impact of the financial crisis on higher education in the United States. *International Higher Education*, (59).
- Geiger, R.L., & Heller, D.E. (2011). *Financial trends in higher education: The United States* (Working paper No. 6). State College, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education.
- Gioia, D.A., & Thomas, J.B. (1996). Identity, image, and issue interpretation: Sensemaking during strategic change in academia. *Administrative science quarterly*, 370-403.
- Gjerding, A.N., Wilderom, C.P., Cameron, S.P., Taylor, A., & Scheunert, K.J. (2006). Twenty practices of an entrepreneurial university. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 18(3), 1-28.
- Gold, J.A., Golden, D.C., & Quatroche, T.J. (1993). The challenge of chief student affairs officers: Planning for the future. *New Directions for Student Services*, 1993(63), 95-107.
- Goldstein, L. (2005). *College and university budgeting: An introduction for faculty and academic administrators*. Washington, DC: National Association of College and University Budget Officers.
- Goldstein, L. (2012). *A guide to college and university budgeting: Foundations for institutional effectiveness*. 4th Ed. Washington, DC: National Association of College and University Budget Officers.

- Gjerding, A.N, Wilderon, C.P.M., Cameron, S.P.B, Taylor, A., & Scheunert, K. (2006). Twenty practices of an entrepreneurial university. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 18,3. Retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10/1787/hemp-v18-art19-en>
- Gros Louis, K.R. (2002). Responsibility center budgeting and management at Indiana University. In D.M. Priest, W.E. Becker, D. Hossler, & E.P. St. John (Eds.), *Incentive-based budgeting systems in public universities* (pp. 93-108). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2(163-194), 105.
- Gumport, P.J., & Sporn, B. (1999). *Institutional adaptation: Demands for management reform and university administration* (pp. 103-145). Springer Netherlands.
- Haeuser, P.N. (2000). *Budget and Planning*. New Directions for Higher Education, no. 111, 75-83. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Harrison, L.M. (2010). Consequences and strategies student affairs professionals engage in their advocacy roles. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 47(2), 197–214.
- Hearn, J.C., Lewis, D.R., Kallsen, L., Holdsworth, J.M., & Jones, L.M. (2006). "Incentives for managed growth": A case study of incentives-based planning and budgeting in at large public research university. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(2), 286-316.
- Heller, D.E. (2006). State support of higher education: Past, present, and future. *Privatization and public universities*, 11-37.
- Hossler, D. (2003). Students and families as revenue: The impact on institutional behaviors. In D.M. Priest & E.P. St. John (Eds.), *Privatization and public universities* (pp. 109-128). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Hossler, D. (2006). Students and families as revenue: The impact on institutional behavior. In D.M. Priest & E.P. St. John (Eds.), *Privatization and public universities* (pp. 175- 188). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Johnstone, D.B. (2001). Financing higher education: Who should pay? in Philip G. Altbach, Robert O Berdahl, and Patricia J. Gumport, Eds. *American Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Johnson, J.N. (2005). *Budget planning at three schools within an urban university with decentralized budgeting*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 3209578)

- Kezar, A. (2004). What is more important to effective governance: Relationships, trust, and leadership, or structures and formal processes?. *New directions for higher education*, 2004(127), 35-46.
- Kezar, A., & Eckel P. (2008). Advancing diversity agendas on campus: examining transactional and transformational presidential leadership styles. *International Journal of Leadership Education*, 11(4). 379-405.
- Kinzie, J., & Kuh, G.D. (2004). Going deep: Learning from campuses that share responsibility for student success. *About Campus*, 9(5), 2-8.
- Kosten, L.A. (2006). *Academic deans' perspectives on the effectiveness of Responsibility Centered Management*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation Theses and Database. (UMI 3207890).
- Kotler, P. & Murphy, P.E. (1981). Strategic planning for higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 52(5), 470-489.
- Kuh, G.D. (2007). Student engagement in the first year of college. In Upcraft, L. M., Gardner, J.N., & Barefoot, B. O. (Eds.). *Meeting challenges and building support: Creating a climate for first-year student success*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G.D., & Whitt, E. J. (1988). *The Invisible Tapestry. Culture in American Colleges and Universities*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education, Report No. 1, 1988. Association for the Study of Higher Education, Dept. E, One Dupont Circle, Suite 630, Washington, DC 20036-1183.
- Kuk, L., & Banning, J.H., (2009). Designing student affairs organizational structures: Perceptions of senior student affairs officers. *NASPA Journal*, 46(1), 94-117.
- Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. (1995). Analyzing social settings. *Belmont, CA: Wadsworth*.
- Long, B.T. (2013). The financial crisis and college enrollment: How have students and their families responded? In J. Brown and C. Hoxby (eds.) *How the Great Recession Affected Higher Education*. Retrieved from: <http://papers.nber.org/books/brow12-2>
- Lovell, C.D., & Kosten, L. A. (2000). Skills, knowledge, and personal traits necessary for success as a student affairs administrator: A meta-analysis of thirty years of research. *NASPA Journal*, 37(4), 553-572.
- Lyall, K. (2011). *Seeking sustainable public universities: The legacy of the great recession*. Center for Studies of Higher Education.
- Manning, K., & Kinzie, J.L. (2006). *One size does not fit all: Traditional and innovation models of student affairs practice*. CRC Press.

- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1995). Recording, managing and analyzing data. *Marshall, C.; Rossman, G. Designing qualitative research*, 2, 109-119.
- Mason, T., & Eldridge, J. (2010). Communicating with stakeholders. *New Directions for Student Services*, 129, 43-58.
- Massy, W.F. (1996). *Resource allocation in higher education*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- McBride, B.A., Neiman, S., & Johnson, J. (2000). Responsibility-centered management: A 10-year nursing assessment. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 16, 201-209.
- Meisinger Jr, R.J., & Dubeck, L.W. (1984). *College & University Budgeting. An Introduction for Faculty and Academic Administrators*. National Association of College and University Business Officers, One Dupont Circle, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20036-1178.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Sage.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). The nature of managerial work.
- McCormick, A., & Zhao, C. (2005). The Carnegie Classification of US institutions of higher education. Retrieved February, 9, 2013. Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of Organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Morgan, M.F., & Policello, S.M. (2010). Getting started in student affairs development. *New Directions for Student Services*. 130 Summer Wiley InterScience.
- Morphew, C.C. and Eckel, P.D. (2009) *Privatizing the Public University: Perspectives from Across the Academy*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Murray, B. (2000). Can academic values mesh with fiscal responsibility? Business-like budgeting clashes with team spirit, some psychologists say. *Monitor*, 31(2), 46.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). Two decades of developments in qualitative inquiry: A personal, experiential perspective. *Qualitative social work*, 1(3), 261-283.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G.R. (1974). Organizational decision making as a political process: The case of a university budget. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 135-151.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G.R. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Stanford University Press.

- Porter, M.V. (2013) Variations on a theme of RCM. National Association of College and University Business Officers. Retrieved from:
http://www.Porter.org/Search_Results_Page.html?q=RCM
- Porterfield, K.T., Roper, L.D., & Whitt, E.J. (2011). Redefining our mission: What does higher education need from student affairs? *Journal of College & Character*, 12(4), 1-7.
- Priest, D.M, Becker, W.E., Hossler, D., & St. John, E.P. (2002). Why incentive-based budgeting systems in the public sector and why now? In D.M. Priest, W.E. Becker, D. Hossler, & E.P. St. John (Eds.), *Incentive-based budgeting systems in public universities* (pp. 93-108). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Priest, D.M., & Boon, R.D. (2006). Incentive-based budgeting systems in the emerging environment. In D.M. Priest & E.P. St. John (Eds.), *Privatization and public universities* (pp. 175- 188). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Priest, D.M., Jacobs, B.A., & Boon, R.D. (2006). Privatization of business and auxiliary functions. In D.M. Priest & E.P. St. John (Eds.), *Privatization and public universities* (pp. 189-202). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Priest, D.M., St. John, E.P., & Tobin, W. (2002). Incentive-based budgeting: An evolving approach. In D. M. Priest, W. E. Becker, D. Hossler, & E. P. St. John, (Eds.), *Incentive- based budgeting systems in public universities* (pp. 227–235). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Rhoades, G. (2001). Managing productivity in an academic institution: Rethinking the whom, which, what, and whose of productivity. *Research in higher education*, 42(5), 619-632.
- Romano, R.C., Hanish, J., Phillips, C., & Waggoner, M.D. (2009). The new normal: Senior student affairs officers speak out about budget cutting. *New Directions for Student Service*, 129, 59-70.
- Rizzo, M.J. (2006). State preferences for higher education spending. In R. Ehrenberg (Ed.), *What's happening to public higher education?* (pp.3-35).
- Schroeder, C.C. (1996). The student learning imperative: Implications for student affairs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37(2), 118-22.
- Schuh, J.H. (2003). The financial environment of student affairs. *New Directions for Student Services*, 103, 3-16.

- Schuh, J.H., & Gansemer-Topf, A.M. (2010). The role of student affairs in student learning *assessment, Occasional Paper No.7*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois and Indiana University, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment
- Scott, R.A., & Bischoff, P.M. (2000). Preserving student affairs in times of fiscal constraint: a case history. *NASPA Journal*, 2000, Vol. 38, no 1.
- Selznick, P. (1966). 1949. *TVA and the grassroots: A study in the sociology of formal organization*.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- Smart, J.C., & John, E.P.S. (1996). Organizational culture and effectiveness in higher education: A test of the “culture type” and “strong culture” hypotheses. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18(3), 219-241.
- Sontheimer, K. (1994). Privatizing higher education. *Privatizing education and educational choice: Concepts, plans and experiences*, 163-182.
- Stake, R.E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp.443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stocum, D.L. & Rooney, P.M. (1997). Responding to resource constraints: A departmentally based system of responsibility center management. *Change: The magazine of higher learning*, 29:5, 50-57.
- Strauss, J.C., & Curry, J.R. (2002). *Responsibility center management: Lessons from 25 years of decentralized management*. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy.ulib.iupui.edu>
- Strauss, J., Curry, J., & Whalen, E. (1996). Revenue responsibility budgeting. In W. F. Massy (Ed.) (1996).
- Thelin, J.R. (1997). *The Rise of American Research Universities: Elites and Challengers in the Postwar Era*. By Hugh Davis Graham and Nancy Diamond. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997. viii, 319pp. \$39.95, ISBN0-8018-5425-3.).
- Thelin, J.R. (2013). *The Rising Costs of Higher Education: A Reference Handbook: A Reference Handbook*. ABC-CLIO.
- Torres, V. and Walbert J. (2010) Envisioning the future of student affairs: Final report of the task force on the future of student affairs. Appointed jointly by ACPA and NASPA. Retrieved from http://www.cas.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/TF_final_narrative.pdf

- Varlotta, L.E., & Jones, B.C. (2010). *Student affairs budgeting and financial management in the midst of fiscal crisis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Volpatti, M.C. (2013). Privatization of public universities: how the budget system affects the making strategies of deans. (Doctoral Dissertation).
- Upcraft, M., Gardner, J.N., & Barefoot, B.O. (2005). *Challenging and supporting the first-year student: a handbook for improving the first year of college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weick, K.E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(1), 1-19.
- Weick, K.E., Sutcliffe, K.M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sense making. *Organization Science*, 16(4), 409-421.
- Whalen, E.L. (1991). Principles of Responsibility Center Budgeting. In E.L. Whalen. *Responsibility center budgeting: An approach to decentralized management of institutions of higher education*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Whalen, E.L. (2002). The case, if any, for responsibility center budgeting. In D. M. Priest, W. E. Becker, D. Hossler, & E. P. St. John (Eds.), *Incentive-based budgeting systems in public universities* (pp. 111–135). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Woodard, D. (1995). *Budgeting as a tool for policy in student affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Yin, R.K. (2011). *Applications of case study research*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Zumeta, W. (2001). Public policy and accountability in higher education: Lessons from the past and present for the new millennium. *The states and public higher education policy: Affordability, access, and accountability*, 155-197.

Appendix A. IRB Approval Letter



INDIANA UNIVERSITY
OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH
Office of Research Compliance

To
: Stevan Veldkamp

From: 
Human Subjects Office
Office of Research Compliance – Indiana University

Date: May 23, 2016

RE: NOTICE OF EXEMPTION - NEW PROTOCOL

Protocol Title: PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES INCENTIVE BASED BUDGETING
SYSTEMS: HOW RESPONSIBILITY CENTER BUDGET SYSTEMS AFFECT THE
DECISION MAKING STRATEGY OF STUDENT AFFAIRS LEADERS

Study #: 1604664656

Funding Agency/Sponsor: None

Status: Exemption Granted | Exempt

Study Approval Date: May 23, 2016

The Indiana University Institutional Review Board (IRB) EXE000001 | Exempt recently reviewed the above-referenced protocol. In compliance with (as applicable) 45 CFR 46.109 (d) and IU Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Research Involving Human Subjects, this letter serves as written notification of the IRB's determination. **Under 45 CFR 46.101(b) and the SOPs, as applicable, the study is accepted as Exempt (2) Category 2: Surveys/Interviews/Standardized Educational Tests/Observation of Public Behavior Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior if: i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; or ii) any disclosure of the human subjects**

responses outside the research would not reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects financial standing, employability or reputation, with the following determinations:

Acceptance of this study is based on your agreement to abide by the policies and procedures of the Indiana University Human Research Protection Program and does not replace any other approvals that may be required. Relevant policies and procedures governing Human Subjects Research can be found at:
http://researchcompliance.iu.edu/hso/hs_guidance.html.

The Exempt determination is valid indefinitely. Substantive changes to approved exempt research must be requested and approved prior to their initiation. Investigators may request proposed changes by submitting an amendment through the KC IRB system. The changes are reviewed to ensure that they do not affect the exempt status of the research. Please check with the Human Subjects Office to determine if any additional review may be needed.

You should retain a copy of this letter and all associated approved study documents for your records. Please refer to the assigned study number and exact study title in future correspondence with our office. Additional information is available on our website at <http://researchcompliance.iu.edu/hso/index.html>.

If your source of funding changes, you must submit an amendment to update your study documents immediately.

If you have any questions or require further information, please contact the Human Subjects Office via email at irb@iu.edu or by phone at 317-274-8289 (Indianapolis) or 812-856-4242 (Bloomington).

You are invited, as part of ORA's ongoing program of quality improvement, to **participate in a short survey** to assess your experience and satisfaction with the IRB related to this approval. We estimate it will take you approximately **5 minutes to complete the survey**. The survey is housed on a Microsoft SharePoint secure site that requires CAS authentication. This survey is being administered by REEP; please contact us at reep@iu.edu if you have any questions or require additional information. Simply click on the link below, or copy and paste the entire URL into your browser to access the survey: https://www.sharepoint.iu.edu/sites/iu-ora/survey/Lists/Compliance/IRB_Survey/NewForm.aspx.

/enclosures

Appendix B. Letter of Invitation to Study Participants

Dear Student Affairs Leader,

Hello, my name is Steve Veldkamp and I am a doctoral candidate from the Higher Education Department in the School of Education at Indiana University-Bloomington. I am contacting you to discuss your participation in an exploratory study of how student affairs leaders make decisions in a Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) budget environment. I am conducting interviews as part of my dissertation to gain a better understanding of how decision making is or is not affected by this budget model.

The interviews are expected to last approximately 45 to 60 minutes and will be guided by a set of interview questions (attached). The questions will be open-ended to allow the process to be less structured and more conversational. This will permit you to bring forth ideas and concepts not previously considered in the designed questions.

I added this space here

I will be contacting your office the week of May 16, 2016 to discuss whether you would like to participate in the research study, address any preliminary questions you may have, and begin the process of scheduling a time for the interview. Please do not hesitate to ask if you need additional information concerning this study to help you with your decision to participate. I can be contacted by email at veldkamp@indiana.edu or by phone at (812) 855-6372. Additionally, you may contact my dissertation director, Dr. Don Hossler, at hossler@indiana.edu.

Please note this study has been reviewed and approved by Indiana University Bloomington's Institutional Review Board. Also, if you choose to participate the protocol will include a fact checking phase of your interview. At any point in time if you have any comments or concerns resulting from your participation in this study, you may contact the IRB at (812) 856-4242 or by email at hsc@indiana.edu.

Finally, I am attaching the consent form and questions for your review. Thank you in advance for your consideration to participate in this student affairs study.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Steve Veldkamp
Ed.D. Candidate
Higher Education School of Education
Indiana University

Appendix C. Interviews Questions

Demographics of Participant:

1. Date:
2. Institution:
3. Student Affairs Position and Areas/Units Supervised:
4. Participant Name and Title:
5. Tenure in student affairs position.
 - a. How long have you been at this institution?
 - b. How long have you served in your current position? If you held other positions at this university, were they part of student affairs?
 - c. What areas of student affairs are you directly responsible for making decisions?
 - d. How large is your budget in these areas? How much budgetary authority do you have
 - e. What is the general amount of your budget responsibility including staffing?
 - f. What areas are you indirectly responsible for making decisions? Have you worked at another university that used an RCM budget model?

Perception Questions:

1. How have changes in state appropriations to your institution affected your student affairs department?
2. Please explain in detail, how you work within the RCM environment to achieve your goals of increasing financial support for student affairs (please provide examples)?
3. How does the RCM budget model impact how you make decisions for student affairs?
 - a. What are your perceptions of how student affairs services are valued by
 - i. Units reporting to student affairs?
 - ii. Academic school leadership?
 - iii. Central administration?
 - b. Do you think your decision making strategies have changed as a result of working within RCM environments?
4. What are your thoughts and impressions about the RCM budget model?
 - a. Advantage of the RCM model for student affairs?

- b. Disadvantage of the RCM model for student affairs?
 - c. Have you worked and or are you knowledgeable about other models? If so, would you prefer to manage your unit under a different budget system? Why or why not?
- 5. Do you perceive any effects on how an RCM model effects how student affairs are structured and delivered?
 - a. Does it affect organizational structure?
 - b. Does it increase or decrease (i.e. autonomy, decentralization, or ambiguity)?
 - c. Does it affect the delivery of services? If so how?
- 6. What are your perceptions of how RCM influences positioning and/or prioritization of decision making in the acquisition of campus resources?
 - a. How do you positon student affairs to increase revenue?
 - b. Describe in as much detail as possible how you prioritize your decision making regarding obtaining income from the following:
 - i. Central administration leadership
 - ii. Academic school leadership
 - 1. Does/has the way you interact with academic schools/units changed in any ways as a result of RCM?
 - 2. Does/has the frequency with which you interact with academic schools/units increased or decreased?
 - 3. To what extent do you have a different relationships with acadmic schools/units?
 - iii. Entrepreneurial activities (such as student fees, auxiliary enterprises, and other campus partnerships)
 - iv. External stakeholders (for example grants, donors, and corporate sponsorships)
- 7. Anything you would like to add that has not been addressed?

Appendix D. Informed Consent

IRB Study Number: 01604664656

PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES INCENTIVE BASED BUDGETING SYSTEMS: HOW RESPONSIBILITY CENTER BUDGET SYSTEMS AFFECT THE DECISION MAKING STRATEGY OF STUDENT AFFAIRS LEADERS

Please read the following to consent to this study.

Dear Student Affairs Leader,

You are invited to participate in a research study on how student affairs leaders make strategic decisions in the context of an RCM budget environment. You were selected as a possible subject because you are in a student affairs leadership position at a public institution with a specific budgeting model that will be studied. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study. The study is being conducted by Dr. Donald Hossler, faculty member, and Steve Veldkamp a doctoral candidate in Higher Education in the School of Education at Indiana University Bloomington.

Study Purpose:

- The purpose of collecting the information is to better understand how student affairs leaders make decisions at institutions using RCM models.
- The information is for an Indiana University Bloomington doctoral dissertation.

Study Process:

- If you agree to be in the study, you will do the following things:
- Be interviewed for approximately 45 to 60 minutes using guided questions.
- The responses will be recorded and transcribed.
- All direct quotes and paraphrased statements will remain confidential. Neither the staff member nor the institution will be named. Institutions will be labeled, e.g. A#1. A = the coded name of the institution, and #1 = the student affairs leader. When referring to a specific student affairs leader, numbers will be used for the hierarchy of student affairs leader responding. If hierarchical roles are shared, then whoever is interviewed first will be assigned #1, #2, #3, etc.).

Confidentiality:

- We cannot guarantee absolute confidentiality, however, all efforts will be made to keep your personal information private.
- Interview will be taped, the tapes will be stored on a secured server and will be destroyed once the transcription is completed.
- All interviewees will have the option of fact checking all responses and quotes.
- Only coded interview transcripts will be shared with the research committee upon request.
- Once transcriptions are complete and personal information is coded audio files will be destroyed.

- Organizations that may inspect and/or copy your research records for quality assurance and data analysis include groups such as the study investigator and his/her research associates, the Indiana University Institutional Review Board or its designees, the study sponsor, Indiana University, and (as allowed by law) state or federal agencies, specifically the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP).

Compensation:

- You will not receive payment for taking part in this study.

Contact Information:

- Questions and comments can be directed to:

Steve Veldkamp
veldkamp@indiana.edu
 (812) 855-6372

Dr. Don Hossler
hossler@indiana.edu.

- For questions about your rights as a research participant or to discuss comments or concerns, please contact the IU Human Subjects Office at (317) 278-3458 or (812) 856-4242 or (800) 696-2949.

Study is Voluntary

- Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to take part or may leave the study at any time. Leaving the study will not result in any penalty.
- The respondents may decline to be interviewed and/or may skip any question they feel is a risk to maintaining confidentiality.
- Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your current or future relations with Indiana University

Curriculum Vitae

Stevan “Steve” J. Veldkamp

8143 Bel Moore Boulevard, Indianapolis, Indiana 46259

812-219-3604, sveldkamp4@icloud.com

EDUCATION

Doctor of Higher Education and Student Affairs

May 2018

Indiana University - Bloomington, Indiana

Doctor of Educational Leadership

May 1999-2002

Course work: assessment and student development

Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan

Masters of Science, Communications

May 1997

Grand Valley State University, Grand Rapids, Michigan

Bachelor of Science, Public Relations and Advertising

May 1988

Grand Valley State University, Allendale, Michigan

Associate of Arts, Liberal Arts

June 1986

Northwestern Michigan College, Traverse City, Michigan

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Assistant Dean of Students

August 2003 – present

and Director of Student Life and Learning

Indiana University - Bloomington, Indiana

The dual-role provides both divisional and departmental leadership. Serve as part of the divisional leadership team, as a representative of the division on campus-wide committees, as well as inter-divisional committees, taskforces, and behavioral and crisis response teams.

Department responsibilities include setting strategic direction, supervision, budget management, and crisis management for a dynamic department with four focus areas. These areas include Student Organization Support, Fraternity and Sorority Life, Leadership and Inclusion Development, and Community Engagement. Responsible for setting and interpreting policies and for designing and implementing support services which contribute to student learning measured by a comprehensive evaluation and assessment program. Report to the Vice Provost for Student Affairs and Dean of Students.

Responsible for:

- Creation of high performing work environment for 11 professional staff members and 15 doctoral, masters and practicum students and 37 undergraduate scholars/interns
- Departmental budget of 1 million and student activity fee budget of 1.2 million dollars.
- Strategic direction, staffing, and policy creation and interpretation for 750 student organizations including: registration process, risk mitigation, educational support, conduct program, campus space reservations, and educational programs.
- Serve as primary advisor to student government.
- Development of a campus-wide curricular and co-curricular leadership development programs (600 students in 1- and 2-credit courses and retreats/institutes). Leadership program includes four signature events including first year leadership orientations, emerging leader retreats, student leader retreats, and the LeaderShape Institute.
- Strategic direction and staffing support for a community engagement program including a civic scholars program, community liaison program, training and coordination support for a campus-wide professional network of faculty and staff.
- Strategic direction, crisis management, and staffing support for 75 fraternity and sorority chapters and 8,000 student members. Focus areas include educational programs designed to address social issues of sexual misconduct, alcohol/drug misuse, and hazing prevention. Liaison and support for 40 house corporations regarding environmental health and maintenance for facilities with a capacity of 3,900 students.

Divisional Level Highlights:

- Developed and implemented the Division of Student Affairs (DSA) assessment and planning committee including the acquisition of Campus Labs Baseline (Assessment) platform.
- Coordinated the DSA strategic planning process.
- Developed a partnership with the School of Education to create a joint DSA development officer.
- Chaired DSA searches for the Director of Development (2012), Assistant Dean for Parent, Commuter Students, and Community Affairs (2014) and served on the Indiana Memorial Union Executive Director Search (2015).
- Served as the DSA representative on the Dean/Division Five Year Review Committee (2014).
- Developed a Provost proposal for enhancing curricular and co-curricular community engaged learning support which included four new positions and a faculty incentive budget.

Departmental Level Highlights:

- Asked by the Provost Office to design an office structure and budget for local, national, and international curricular and co-curricular community engagement.
- Instituted the redevelopment of the department including the creation of a strategic plan, job descriptions, performance evaluation program, and budget reconstruction to match student success and learning priorities. Provost approved departmental name change in 2011 from Student Activities to Student Life and Learning.
- Created a vision, plan, and resource acquisition program to start and grow Community Engagement and Leadership Development programs in partnership with academic schools and student service partnerships.

- Proposed and added eight new professional staff and three graduate positions.
- Strengthened a relationship with the School of Education, Higher Education and Student Affairs program to host doctoral, graduate and practicum students.
- Raised 2.4 million dollars in staffing and leadership development support over a 12 year period.
- Spearheaded the creation of a co-curricular involvement, engagement, and assessment database with a variety of academic and student services units on seven campuses.

Committees:

- Athletic Scholarship Appeals Committee
- Behavioral Crisis Incidents Committee
- Black History Month Committee
- Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement Committee
- Campus Web Advisory Board and Maintenance Committee
- Campus Wide Assessment Task Force, Comprehensive Summary of IU Bloomington Assessment Efforts Subcommittee, Chair
- Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Regulations Compliance Committee
- Engineering Positive Social Environments Committee, Chair
- Recreational Sports Advisory Board
- Student Affairs Assessment and Planning Committee, Chair
- Student Affairs Dean's Leadership Team
- Student Leadership Advisory Board
- Student Organizations Legal Relationship Taskforce
- Under-Represented Student Organization Space Committee, Chair

Executive Director, Center for Fraternity and Sorority Research

July 2005 – present

Indiana University - Bloomington, Indiana

Responsible for the management of a 501.C3, non-profit research center including fundraising, staff supervision, survey dissemination and analysis, thesis and dissertation awards, research grant awards, media interviews, and longitudinal annotated bibliography of literature.

- Responsible for creating an international fraternity and sorority research agenda.
- Serve as Principle Investigator for the Fraternity and Sorority Experience Survey (FSES) a perceptual survey of fraternity and sorority chapter experiences. Clients include campuses and fraternity/sorority headquarters.
- Consult with researchers on evaluation, assessment and research projects.

Highlights:

- Developed a sustainable budget model which allowed CFSR to hire a new full time position and tripled the funding for research grants, masters, and doctoral awards.
- Created a relationship with Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research to co-host the FSES instrument.
- Coordinated and conducted the FSES validation project with Dr. Vasti Torres.
- Coordinated fraternity and sorority community assessment for the Committee for Institutional Cooperation (Big Ten) schools in 2010 and 2016.

Assistant Director of Student Activities and Leadership Programs

August 1994 – July 2003

Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan

Planned and provided direct supervision for student leadership development, transition programs, student organizations advising, fraternity and sorority development, and supervised campus ecumenical center.

- Created a high performing work environment for 1 professional staff member and 3 doctoral and masters' students.
- Responsible for the facilities management, budget administration, policy development, and planning for the campus ecumenical center and student organization meeting room and office complex.
- Advised and implemented developmental, judicial, crisis management, and recognition responsibilities for 400 student organizations including 22 fraternities and sororities.
- Served as primary advisor to fraternity and sorority councils and individual chapters.

Highlights:

- Served as interim director.
- Coordinated the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. Steering Committee comprised of 25 faculty, staff, students and community members. Developed a mission and strategic plan which included a faculty recognition and grant program to infuse social justice topics into the curriculum. Created a weeklong celebration culminating in a campus and community convocation.
- Participated in a national conversation to bring transformative change to fraternities and sororities. Served as primary author for the *Call for Values Congruence* 2003.
- Assisted in the coordination of the newly reorganized student affairs division vision and strategic planning and assessment process.
- Conceptualized and implemented a four day student transition program for up to 1,500 first year students.
- Initiated a staff and faculty committee to develop a grant-supported service learning department.
- Created the campus-wide leadership program including internal structure, training program, workshop design, co-curricular transcript, campus speaker series, and budget establishment. Empowered a core group of students to plan and implement a speaker series and service activities.
- Assisted students in starting five culturally based fraternities and sororities. Transformed the fraternity and sorority system into a larger, diverse, and more responsible nationally recognized community.

Committees:

- Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Regulations Compliance Committee
- Engineering a Positive Campus Climate Committee
- Greek Task Force Committee, Chair
- Human Resources Training and Development Advisory Board
- Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. Steering Committee, Elected Chair, 2000 and 2001
- Student Fee Assessment Committee
- Student Union Committee
- United Way Campaign Committee

Educational Consultant, College View Partners

June 1993 – August 1994

Cincinnati, Ohio

Served as a consultant and account executive to assist institutions with admissions marketing strategies. Responsible for liaison work with enrollment management staff and multimedia designers. Conducted high school students and guidance counselor focus group research concerning college admissions and matriculation.

Highlights:

- Researched, visited, and consulted with 79 colleges and universities
- Attended and presented at admissions conferences

Student Organizations Advisor

July 1992 – May 1993

University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire, Wisconsin

Responsible for advising and policy interpretation for 276 student organizations and fraternities and sororities. Supervised the Student Organizations Complex, 40 office spaces and 3 meeting rooms, and an administrative assistant as part of the student union.

- Built and enhanced community programs within the student union and student affairs departments.
- Served as primary advisor to fraternity and sorority councils and individual chapters.

Highlights:

- Created a student organization recruitment fair as part of Welcome Week.
- Initiated and developed a plan for a comprehensive leadership development series for student organizations leaders.
- Created a task force to review the relationship with fraternity and sorority community.

Committees:

- Academic Achievement and University-wide Honorary Celebration, Chair
- Greek Taskforce, Chair
- Alcohol Policy Committee
- Student Senate Renewal Committee

Account Executive

May 1991 – June 1992

Seyferth & Associates Public Relations Counselors

Grand Rapids, Michigan

Responsible for client research, writing new briefs, and developing communication plans/proposals for national and international clients. Coordinated special events and media relations programs.

Highlights:

- Served on the implementation and media relations teams for Nissan of North America Headquarters grand opening.
- Created daily international news and policy reports for the top 50 Nissan executives.
- Prepared clients for national media interviews.

Alumni Relations Special Assistant

September 1990 –

April 1991

(Sabbatical leave appointment)

Grand Valley State University, Allendale, Michigan

Trained and supervised an alumni relations and fundraising student telephone bank.

Student Life Office, Graduate Assistant

August 1988 – August 1990

Grand Valley State University, Allendale, Michigan

Hired, trained and supervised a staff of 17 students responsible for marketing and promotions of university, department and student organization involvement opportunities.

Highlights:

- Proposed a new office name and prepared a campus communication plan.

Assistant to the Vice President of University Relations August 1988 – May 1990

Grand Valley State University, Allendale, Michigan

Assisted in tracking political legislation and preparation of budget materials for internal and external budget presentations. Student host at foundation dinners and fundraising events.

Highlights:

- Developed university/statehouse budget presentations.
- Developed communication campaign for the grand opening of the Downtown Campus.

TEACHING

Indiana University – Bloomington, IN

- Higher Education and Student Affairs masters assessment course advisor (2015)
- School of Education, Leadership Seminars: 495 Fraternity and Sorority Relevance 2010- 2013
- School of Education, Leadership Seminars: 206 Leading at IU 2008, 2009, 2011
- School of Education, Leadership Seminars: 495 Senior Capstone 2009
- School of Education, Leadership Seminars: 210 Leadership Essentials 2008
- School of Education, Leadership Seminars: 206 Leading at IU

Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI

- School of Communications, 170 Interpersonal Communication 2000

LEADERSHIP FACILITATION

Faculty, The Gathering (mid-level professional institute) June 2016

Association of Fraternal Leadership and Values/Estes Park, CO.

Developed a comprehensive professional development curriculum for a five-day institute for 60 student affairs staff.

Co - Director, The Interfraternity Institute (IFI)

July 2003 – June 2013

Fraternity Executives Association/Indiana University

- Developed and implemented a comprehensive, progressive curriculum for nationally recognized, five-day professional development institute. The institute is eligible for masters' and doctoral level credit through the School of Education.

- Provided logistical support and facility management for the institute.
- Designed, administered, and compiled evaluation and assessment information.
- Coordinated marketing and communications initiatives.
- Recruited and trained institute faculty of 12 notable higher education leaders.

Director, NASPA Region IV East 2009-2011
New Professionals Institute (NPI)

Elgin, Illinois and Minneapolis, Minnesota

- Coordinated and created curriculum for the two day entry-level professional development institute for 25-30 participants.
- Provided logistical support and facility management for the institute.

Coordinator and Facilitator, International Service Trip 2007- 2010, 2012

University of Wisconsin – Lacrosse, Wisconsin

- Seven-day service trips and service sites for 15-20 students in Westmorland, Jamaica.

Advisor and Facilitator, Youth Advocating Learning and Leadership 2008

Indiana University - Bloomington, Indiana

- Five-day hurricane relief service trip for 70 Students, Service Trip Advisor, Biloxi, Mississippi.

Cluster Facilitator, LeaderShape 2006

Indiana University - Bloomington, Indiana

- Six-day institute for 60 students: Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Coordinator and Facilitator 1999 - 2003

Fall and Winter Leadership Retreats

Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI

- Coordinated and created curriculum for the two-day retreats for 50 students.

Facilitator, IMPACT Leadership Retreats 2000 - 2003

Ball State University, University of Oregon, Kansas State University

- Three-day leadership institute for 75 students.

Coordinator and Facilitator 1997 - 2003

IMPACT Leadership Retreats

Western Michigan University, Mattawan, Michigan

- Three-day leadership institute for 75 students.

Lead Facilitator, Futures Quest Leadership 2001

Bradford Woods, Indiana

- Three-day leadership institute for 75 students.

Facilitator, Undergraduate Interfraternity Institute 1996, 1998 - 2001

Butler University, Indiana

- Five-day leadership institute for 75 students.

LEADERSHIP PRESENTATIONS and WORKSHOPS

- Veldkamp, S., Ahonen-Cogswell, C., & Maynen, D., (2017). *The fraternity and sorority experiences survey*. Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors Annual Meeting. Atlanta, GA.
- Veldkamp, S., Ahonen-Cogswell, C., & Maynen, D., (2015). *The fraternity and sorority experiences survey: Implications of real life from data*. Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors Annual Meeting. Fort Worth, TX.
- Monteaux, K. & Veldkamp, S. (2012). *Conversations creating change: Social class and fraternity/sorority life*. Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors Annual Meeting. Indianapolis, IN.
- Fisher, K., Maynen, D., & Veldkamp, S. (2012). *Fraternity and sorority validation project results*. Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors Annual Meeting. Indianapolis, IN.
- Veldkamp, S. (2011) *History of the fraternity and sorority values movement*. Interfraternity Institute: Bloomington, IN.
- Veldkamp, S. (2009) *Assessment zeitgeist*. Interfraternity Institute: Bloomington, IN.
- Schendel, K. & Veldkamp, S. (2008). *Fraternity and sorority normative data*. Association of Fraternity Advisors: Denver, CO.
- Schendel, K. & Veldkamp, S. (2008). *Mentorship*, Association of Fraternity Advisors: Denver, CO.
- Baker, E., Fredrick, M., & Veldkamp, S. (2008) *Assessing fraternity and sorority essential learning Outcomes*. Fraternity Executive Association, Miami, FL.
- Veldkamp, S. (2007) *Rituals are essential learning outcomes*, Interfraternity Institute: Bloomington, IN.
- Veldkamp, S., Schendel, K., Jelke, T., (2008) *Assessing the Call for Values Congruence Using the Fraternity and Sorority Experience Survey*. Association of Fraternity Advisors: Atlanta, GA.
- Jahansouz, S., & Veldkamp, S. (2007). *Fraternities and sororities: how they can become a proactive tool vs. a reactive liability*. Association of Fraternity Advisors: Cincinnati, OH.
- Veldkamp, S. (2007) *Assessment in Greek life*. Interfraternity Institute: Bloomington, IN.
- Veldkamp S., (2006) *Tipping point leadership*. Western Greek Regional Association Professional Pathway: San Francisco, CA.
- Veldkamp S., (2006) *Fraternity and sorority learning outcomes*. Presented at the Association of Fraternity Advisors Drive-In Conference: Greencastle, IN.

- Jelke, T., Schendel, K., & Veldkamp, S. (2005) *Assessing the call for values congruence*. Association of Fraternity Advisors: Atlanta, GA.
- Veldkamp S., (2005) *Practitioner, scholar, or both*. Presented at the Western Greek Regional Association Professional Pathway: San Francisco, CA.
- McRee M., Hayes M., Osteen, L., & Veldkamp, S., (2003) *Assessing a common standard for fraternity and sorority*. Presented at the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators: St. Louis, MO.
- Osteen, L. and McRee, M., & Veldkamp, S. (2002). *Voice of denial: stories of exclusive and unscholarly practice*. Presented at the American College Personnel Association: Long Beach, CA.
- Hockman, J., McRee, M., Osteen, L., Smithhisler, P., & Veldkamp, S. (2002). *Revolutionizing the concept of the fraternity and sorority*. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators: Boston, MA.
- Eberly, C., McGee, B., & Veldkamp, S. (1999). *Academic assessment*. Association of Fraternity Advisors: Dallas, TX.
- Veldkamp, S. (1999). *Risk management is ritual*. Midwestern Greek Regional Association: Chicago, IL.
- Veldkamp, S. (1998). *Leadership challenge*, Carlson Leadership Academy, Indianapolis, IN.
- Veldkamp, S. (1998). *Alcohol perceptions*, Carlson Leadership Academy, Indianapolis, IN.
- Veldkamp, S. (1996). *Transition from chapter life to real life*. Carlson Leadership Academy, Columbus, OH
- Bailey R., & Veldkamp S. (1996). *Internet and alumni relations*. National Association of Admissions Conference: Chicago, IL.
- Veldkamp S. (1995). *Group dynamics*. Midwestern Greek Regional Association: Chicago, IL.
- Veldkamp, S. (1993) *Greek identity problem*. Northern Area Greek Regional Association: Fargo, ND.
- Veldkamp, S. (1992) *Alcohol and drugs: what is your definition of right and wrong*, Northern Area Greek Regional Association: Fargo, ND.
- Veldkamp S., (1992) *Counseling and Conflict Management*, Carlson Leadership Academy, Dearborn, MI.

PUBLICATIONS

Veldkamp, S., & Bureau, D. (2012). *The call for values congruence reflection: Together forward*. Perspectives. Summer 2012. 12-15.

Veldkamp, S. (2003). *The call for values congruence: A college and university president's guidelines for principles for practice, aligning collegiate fraternity and sorority behavior with the mission of higher education*. (Andersen, M., Bottoms, B., Curris, C., Hammond, E., McKiernan, H., Spanier, G., Warren, D., & Rogers S., (Eds.). American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU); Washington, D.C.

INVITED KEYNOTES

Veldkamp, S. (2016) *Importance of student involvement*, Student Organization Leadership Conference: Bloomington, IN.

Veldkamp, S. (2012) *Why fraternity is relevant*, Delta Sigma Phi National Leadership Program: Indianapolis, IN.

Veldkamp, S. (2010) *Advisors to coaches to educators*, Sigma National Convention: Minneapolis, MN.

Veldkamp, S. (2010) *Leadership is moments in time when people come together to create change for the common good*. Keynote at Vanderbush Leadership Symposium, Grand Valley State University, Allendale, MI.

Veldkamp, S., (2007) *Greek life today and tomorrow*. Gannon University, Erie PA.

Carole, G., Hockman, J., McRee, M., Osteen, L., & Veldkamp, S., (2002) *Keynote Address*. Presented at the Association of Fraternity Advisors: Columbus, OH.

CONSULTATIONS

Veldkamp, S., & Keopsil, M. (2018) *Community assessment and planning*. Baylor University, Waco, TX.

Veldkamp, S., (2017) *Community assessment and planning*. Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI.

Veldkamp, S., (2017) *Community assessment and planning*. Miami of Ohio, Oxford, OH.

Veldkamp, S. (2016 & 2017) *Current state of higher education: aligning your organization to the future of higher education* Phi Kappa Psi Board of Directors: Indianapolis, IN.

Veldkamp, S. (2012 & 2015) *Current state of higher education: aligning your organization to the future of higher education* Alpha Gamma Delta Sorority Board of Directors: Indianapolis, IN.

Ensor, D., Freeman, M., Sekelsky, M.J., & Veldkamp, S., (2012) *Coalition assessment*

- project*. Grand Valley State University, Allendale, MI.
- Veldkamp, S. (2011 & 2014) *Current state of higher education: aligning your organization to the future of higher education*. Sigma Sorority Board of Directors: Minneapolis, MN and Las Vegas, NV.
- Veldkamp, S. (2010) *Strategic planning*, Facilitator for Presidential Task Force, Delta Upsilon Fraternity, Eugene, OR.
- Bureau, D. & Veldkamp, S. (2010) *Strengths and weakness of big ten fraternity and Sorority communities*: Committee for Institutional Cooperation Annual Meeting: University of Chicago, IL.
- Baker, E., Carroll, A., Henry, M., Mackin, M.B., Osborne, M., Lynch, B., & Veldkamp, S. (2010). *True brother external advisory committee*, Lambda Chi Alpha Fraternity, Indianapolis, IN.
- Veldkamp, S., (2007) *Community assessment and planning*. Gannon University, Erie PA.
- Schendel, K., & Veldkamp, S. (2006). *Community assessment and planning*. Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL.
- Hockman, J., & Veldkamp, S., (2002 & 2003). *Collegiate Greek community standards assessment project*. Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.
- Veldkamp, S., (2002) *Collegiate Greek community standards assessment project*. Grand Valley State University, Allendale, MI.
- Veldkamp, S., Bussee, J., Collins, K., McClain, M., Johnson, D., & Thon, A. (2000). *North Central Accreditation Committee Presentation of Criterion #5*, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI.
- Veldkamp, S. (1996). *Developing a student-run leadership program*, University of Puget Sound: Tacoma, WA.
- Veldkamp, S., Bailey, R. (1996). *Internet and Distance Learning*, Florida Gulf Coast: Fort Meyers, FL.

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS and INVOLVEMENT

Association of Fraternity Advisors (AFA) 1992 – present

- Elected Vice President for Region III, 1998 – 2000
- Area Coordinator 1997 – 1998
- AFA Professional Research Committee 2006 – 2009
- New Professional Award Committee 1998
- Marketing Committee 1995
- Workshops Committee 1994

Association of Interdisciplinary Initiative in Higher Education Law and Policy 2002

Center for Fraternity and Sorority Research 1999 – present

- Named Executive Director 2005 – present
- Elected Vice President 2002 and 2003

Coalition (NALFO, NIC, NPC, and NPHC) Assessment Team 2011

Hazing Prevention Symposium Committee 2010 – 2011

International Leadership Association 2006 – 2011

National Assessment Institute 2007 – 2009

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators 1998 – present

- Invited to participate in Co-Curricular Comprehensive Student Record Confab 2016
- Region IV East New Professionals Institute Coordinator 2009 – 2011
- Student Affairs Vice Presidents, Greek Summit Planning Committee 2004 – 2008
- NASPA Program Committee 2006 and 2008
- Region IV East Board Member 2003 and 2009 – 2011

National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs, Member 1992 – present

HONORS

Delta Upsilon Fraternity President's Circle Award 2011

AFA Robert Shaffer Award 2009

AFA Outstanding Area Coordinator 1997

GVSU Alumni Association Board of Trustees 1991 – 1997

GVSU Leadership Vanderbush Leadership Symposium Keynote 2010

GVSU Michigan Kappa Alumni Achievement Award 1996

WMU Bronco Bravado Staff Award 2001

WMU Greek Community Standards of Excellence Award 2002

WMU National Pan-Hellenic Council, Inc. Advisor Award 1998

WMU Staff Service Award Nomination 1997